

this bill that I made with respect to House bill 3223, and ask that it be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT OF 1942

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3230) to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I make the same explanation with respect to this bill that I made with respect to House bill 3223, and ask that it be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 19 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert Kendall McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, vice Edmund Burke, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following to be assistant surgeons in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:

Arthur B. Gravatt, Jr.
Martin G. Van der Schouw
Avery B. Wight
Harry F. White, Jr.

The following named assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:

William H. Errigong Jack C. Haldeman
William L. Hewitt Robert H. English
C. Dudley Miller John J. Davies
John W. O'Donnell

The following named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:

William J. Brown Charles F. Blankenship
Wendell A. Preston James A. Smith

The following named passed assistant sanitary engineer to be temporary sanitary engineer, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:

Charles C. Spencer

The following named surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:

Michael J. Pescor
Ralph B. Snively

The following named senior surgeons to be temporary medical directors, to rank as such from October 1, 1943:

Edgar W. Norris
Fred T. Foard

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 19 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Edwin B. Morrell, Arlington.
Loie M. Ford, Calipatria.
Felix G. Young, Desert Center.
Norma H. Wilson, Keene.
Margaret O. Quandt, McKittrick.
Genevieve Frahm, Palmdale.
James W. Wilson, Planada.

COLORADO

Winnie Hasty MacIn, Hasty.
Esta M. Fuson, Saguache.

INDIANA

J. Custer Loveless, Clarks Hill.
Mrs. Leland C. Swinford, Clermont.
Ilena M. Loyer, Oolitic.
Edward O. Elrod, Pekin.
Rose K. Hubers, St. Meinrad.
Martin Brink, Wanamaker.
Shirley A. Williams, Westport.
Frank Donaldson, Wheatland.

MAINE

Earl L. Garland, Carmel.
Evangeline L. McKenney, Clinton.

MISSISSIPPI

Eloise G. Stephens, Artesla.
Alice R. Alexander, Lexington.
Iola S. Boswell, Sanatorium.
Effie Abernathy, Shannon.

NEW JERSEY

Francis D. McHugh, Chatham.
Karl D. Alexander, Cliffside Park.
John A. Wheeler, Monmouth Beach.
William J. Ledger, Stockton.

PENNSYLVANIA

George F. Purpur, Danville.
Willard K. Allison, Hickory.
Armena Blumette, Harmarville.
Alice M. Prascsak, Indianola.
Chester M. Fies, Laureldale.
Mary B. Marr, Norristown.
Ethel C. Ufema, Slickville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, minister, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the glory of all that is noble, help us to walk in the light of truth, to be strong in the doing of what is good and to believe in the glory of a noble life. Strong have been the influences which have drawn us from Thee, and subtle have been the pressures which have undermined our faith. We have erred and strayed from Thy ways like lost sheep amid the selfishness, the sordidness, and the cynicism of our time. Yet, we are not satisfied apart from Thee. Forgive us not only our sins but the low aims we have cherished. Pardon, we beseech Thee, not only what we have done amiss but what we have failed to do. Grant us again the vision of Thee. "Touch Thou our dust with spirit hand and make us souls that understand."

We lift our hearts in prayer for our Nation, for those in the service of our country, and for all who lead our people in this critical hour. Grant unto us all the assurance of Thy near presence that we may love mercy, do justly, and walk humbly with Thee. We pray in the spirit of Him who humbles us, yet who makes us strong and gives us courage, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNIVERSARY OF SURRENDER OF CORNWALLIS AT YORKTOWN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BLAND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address on civil aviation delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a number of editorials from newspapers in various States of the Union dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a copy of a letter from the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] to the editor of the Washington Post, together with the agenda of his committee as set up yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Career in Politics" written by Miss Eve Garrette, appearing in the November issue of the magazine The Woman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable William A. Gunter, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement from the cattlemen of Nebraska on the shortage of protein feeds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered to the National Food Conference held in Chicago on September 16, 1943, by Mr. Lou Maxon, former Deputy Administrator of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch, another from the Daily Times of Davenport, Iowa, and a third from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AIR TRANSPORT POLICY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement on air transport policy by four Conservative Members of the British Parliament. I also ask that the preface to the statement be included.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HINSHAW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MILK

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of milk in this country is a problem that confronts not only the Congress but the American people. I read yesterday that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, is selling his dairy herd of 100 milk cows and is going out of the dairy business on his 1,400-acre estate in the State of New York. If all of the dairy farmers of the country follow the example set by Secretary Morgenthau, to go out of the dairy business, it is going to be a bad proposition for the American people. There will not be any milk for them if the other dairy farmers follow his example. I know that most of the dairy farmers are patriotically continuing to milk cows, in spite of the shortage of feed and manpower. I am sorry to see Mr. Morgenthau going out of the dairy business. Of course, I realize that it is not profitable for any farmer to remain in the dairy business, and that may be the reason why Secretary Morgenthau is selling out and quitting milking cows. I wonder.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix in two different particulars; in one to include a brief editorial from the Washington

Post, and in the other an article appearing in the New York Times with reference to Under Secretary of State Mr. E. R. Stettinius.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may sit today and tomorrow during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. As there is no legislative business today, except one resolution, and general debate tomorrow, without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the session this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Lewis Bromfield.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MILK

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I join with my able colleague from Minnesota [Mr. August H. ANDRESEN] in deploring the fact that my distinguished constituent, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, has been forced to sell out his dairy herd of about 100 head on his farm at East Fishkill in Dutchess County at a time when the production of milk is so badly needed. I assume this is due to the fact that he is not able to get sufficient corn from the Middle Western States to feed them but nevertheless it sets a very bad example. For about 3 months I have been urging on the floor of the House that the Congress should act to take the ceiling price of \$1.07 a bushel off corn and let it find its own level. The farmers in the Eastern States, both poultrymen and dairymen, are willing to pay the price if they can only get the corn. They have to have the corn to feed their poultry and dairy cows, and so does even the Secretary of the Treasury. Evidently there is no distinction between his blue-blooded, pedigreed cows and the cows of other farmers. All cows have to have corn to survive, and they are not getting the corn. I hope the Committee on Banking and Currency, or the Committee on Agriculture will do something before November 1 to take the ceiling price off corn if

the O. P. A. refuses to act. I do not blame the corn farmers of Iowa and the Middle Western States for not selling their corn at \$1.07 a bushel when they can get \$1.35 or more a bushel by feeding it to the hogs and turning it into pork.

The situation due largely to the muddling and the stupidity of the O. P. A. in setting a ceiling price of corn at \$1.07 a bushel is becoming more serious every day. The production of milk is falling off rapidly, herds are being sold and an alarming shortage of milk is inevitable this winter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include letters from the commissioners of agriculture of seven Western States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the other day Mr. Wendell Willkie made a rather curious speech. He said, in effect, that the Republican Party has no chance of success, unless it adopts the foreign policy of President Wilson, and, with a few changes, the domestic policy of President Roosevelt. That leaves only one question it seems to me for the voters and that is "Which party is going to be able better to carry out these programs, the party which initiated them, or the party which copied them?" But there was one statement in his speech with which I think we should take issue. He refers to the Smith-Harness bill as a southern democratic bill, thereby reading the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], out of the Republican Party. I made a tabulation of the vote to override the President's veto of this bill and these are the results. Of 183 Democrats who voted, 67 voted to sustain the President, or 37 percent, and of the 165 Republicans who voted, 37 voted to sustain the President, or 22 percent. I think those figures are interesting.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. WRIGHT] should not get excited over Wendell Willkie or anything he says or does. We can tolerate Mr. Willkie's attacks on us southern Democrats, since he is our secret weapon with which we are now breaking up Republican formations behind the lines.

A few nights ago we turned the big bazooka loose in the Republican china shop in St. Louis; and did he produce results?

He is said to be having himself heralded as a second Abraham Lincoln.

He reminds me of a fellow who came here once who thought he favored Henry Clay. He went and got an old Negro barber down in the old St. James Hotel, who used to shave Henry Clay, to give him a shave. He said to him, "Uncle, do you recognize any resemblance between me and Henry Clay?" He said, "Yassah, boss, I sho duz. Your breaf smells just like Mr. Clay's did."

Wendell Willkie's breath does not even smell like Mr. Lincoln's, because Abraham Lincoln never kissed a barmaid in his life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, S. 514, for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix, estate of Kate S. Hamilton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Blanche H. Karsch, of Memphis, Tenn., as administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, the sum of \$7,025.60, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum from December 1, 1931, until the date of payment by the Secretary under the provisions of this act in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for refund of the taxes erroneously paid upon a portion of such estate which was not subject to tax.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 9, strike out "December 1, 1931", and insert "November 23, 1939."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "tax", insert: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. G. CORNELL CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 694, for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the W. G. Cornell Co., of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$840.65, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the amount of the manufacturer's excise tax included in the cost of certain gas ranges purchased by the said company for installation in the Highland Defense Dwellings project of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia, a refund of such excise tax having been denied on the ground that such stoves were not sold directly to the United States by the manufacturer thereof: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. P. WOOLSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 841, for the relief of J. P. Woolsey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. P. Woolsey, of Madison, Wis., the sum of \$500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage and personal injuries sustained by him as the result of a collision between his automobile and a United States Army motor vehicle on May 22, 1941, at Lake Deton, Wis.: *Provided, That* no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT GRIFFIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 302, for the relief of Robert Griffin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Robert Griffin, Milton, Fla., the sum of \$1,616.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Robert Griffin on February 16, 1942, when a United States Navy vehicle backed into his automobile, which was parked on Highway No. 544, just outside the entrance to Saufley Field, near Pensacola, Fla., and pinned the said Robert Griffin between the two vehicles.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word injuries insert "medical and hospital expenses incident thereto."

Page 2, line 3, after the word vehicles, add the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAN CROTTIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1311, for the relief of Dan Crofts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dan Crofts, of near Alma, Crawford County, Ark., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his son, Paul Crofts, who died from the result of injuries sustained when struck by a truck owned and operated by the National Youth Administration, which striking occurred on September 26, 1941, on United States Highway No. 64, near the Vine Prairie School, approximately 2 miles west of Mulberry, Crawford County, Ark., and which said death was caused by the negligent operation of the driver of the truck above-mentioned in that said driver at the time of the injuries aforesaid was driving said truck without keeping a proper lookout and at a high, dangerous, and unlawful rate of speed, and on that part of the highway, which was then and there legally posted as a school zone: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. J. D. PRICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1640, for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated,

to Mrs. J. D. Price, of Lorman, Miss., the sum of \$659.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and expenses incident thereto as a result of a collision between the car in which she was riding and a United States Army truck near Vicksburg, Miss., on June 27, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD A. COX

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1933, for the relief of Ronald A. Cox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ronald A. Cox, Emmett, Idaho, the sum of \$3,955. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ronald A. Cox against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on January 28, 1942, when the motorcycle on which he was riding was in collision with a United States Army truck on the Kalaniana'ole Highway, Island of Oahu, T. H.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word Hawaii, insert: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES T. ROGERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3001, for the relief of James T. Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James T. Rogers, of Birmingham, Ala., the sum of \$300, the amount appropriated by Private Act No. 452, Seventy-fifth Congress, to G. D. Thornhill, and the further sum of \$79.33, in full settlement of all claims against the United States in consideration of James T. Rogers having paid the judgment in the sum of \$300 obtained against him by G. D. Thornhill in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, and court costs in such proceeding in the sum of \$79.33: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of

10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. C. MUNN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 425, authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn for the amount of the obligations incurred by him as guardian of William Taylor Hicks, on the recommendation of a representative of the Veterans' Administration, in providing medical and nursing services, food, household furniture, and other necessities for his said ward, and to allow in full and final settlement of said claim a sum not to exceed \$171.75. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$171.75, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESTERN MARYLAND DAIRY, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 560, for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Western Maryland Dairy, Inc., of Baltimore, Md., the sum of \$3,082.63, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for loss and damage to personal property resulting from a collision which occurred when a truck and tank trailer belonging to such company was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of routes 26 and 27 in Taylorsville, Md., on December 5, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. C. ROBERTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2600, for the relief of M. C. Roberts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to M. C. Roberts, of Tulsa, Okla., the sum of \$1,784.90, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for medical and hospital expenses paid by M. C. Roberts on account of personal injuries sustained by his son, Pvt. Robert G. Roberts, United States Army, when the automobile in which he was riding was involved in a collision, in line of duty, near Sapulpa, Okla., on November 30, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUBEN M. HERREN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2627, for the relief of Ruben M. Herren.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. BUFFETT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. E. B. NEVILLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2730, for the relief of Mrs. E. B. Neville.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. E. B. Neville, the sum of \$1,485, as the amount to which she is entitled as the dependent mother of the late Second Lt. Gene P. Neville, United States Army Air Force, killed in action over France on September 28, 1942, same being equal to 6 months' gratuity pay of Lieutenant Neville: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER R. JONES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2905, for the relief of Walter R. Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter R. Jones, Denver, Colo., the sum of \$5,548.85. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Walter R. Jones against the United States arising out of the death of his wife, Hazel Belle Jones, as the result of a collision when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Iliff Avenue and Colorado Boulevard, Denver, Colo., on July 23, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "\$5,548.85", and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000; to pay the sum of \$615.50 to Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, Littleton, Colo., and to pay the sum of \$584.50 to Mrs. Ella Swenson, Denver, Colo."

Line 7, strike out "of the said Walter R. Jones."

Line 8, after the words "death of", strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "Walter R. Jones."

Line 9, after the names "Belle Jones", insert ", and for personal injuries and expenses for Mrs. Norma S. McKinney and Mrs. Ella Swenson."

Line 10, strike out "she was" and insert in lieu thereof "they were."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson."

MRS. CECILIA MARTIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3076, for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor, of 671 East Broadway, South Boston, Mass., the sum of \$3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses sustained when Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor, was struck by a United States Navy truck on East Broadway, South Boston, Mass., on May 29, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mrs. Cecilia Martin, mother" and insert in lieu thereof "the legal guardian."

Page 1, line 7, after the "\$", insert "3,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor."

HENRY WHITE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2707, for the relief of Henry White.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence of Henry White as of August 25, 1942, the date on which he arrived in the United States, provided he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to inadmissibility because of racial ineligibility.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 8 of page 1 substitute a period for the comma after the word "States" and strike out all of the remaining language in line 8, line 9, and line 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KERNAN R. CUNNINGHAM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 547, for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kernan R. Cunningham, of Davenport, Iowa, the sum of \$631.63, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the loss of or damage to personal effects destroyed by fire on November 28, 1941, while en route from Plainview, Minn., to Moline, Iowa, on a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "while" strike out the remainder of lines 9 and 10, and the word "truck" in line 11, and insert in lieu thereof "being transported incident to his change of station, when en route from Plain-

view, Minn., to Merville, Iowa, on a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK A. McMENAMIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2384, for the relief of Frank A. McMEnamin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank A. McMEnamin, the sum of \$692.60, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on November 28, 1941, at Portland, Oreg., when the car in which he was traveling was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "\$692.60", insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$500."

At the end of bill, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEO PICKRELL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3064, for the relief of Cleo Pickrell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,995.75, to Cleo Pickrell, of Tipton, Okla., in full satisfaction of his claim against the Commodity Credit Corporation for indemnity for the loss of 104 bales of cotton by fire on December 24, 1942, the insurance on which was canceled by Cleo Pickrell shortly before the fire upon the erroneous advice given him by an inspector for the Corporation that the cotton was protected against fire loss by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$7,995.75" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,670.75."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the House bill an identical Senate bill, S. 1293, for the relief of Cleo Pickrell, and to vacate the proceedings by which the House bill was passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,670.75, to Cleo Pickrell, of Tipton, Okla., in full satisfaction of his claim against the Commodity Credit Corporation for indemnity for the loss of cotton by fire on December 24, 1942, the insurance on which was canceled by Cleo Pickrell shortly before the fire upon the erroneous advice given him by an inspector for the Corporation that the cotton was protected against fire loss by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill were laid on the table.

DR. H. H. SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3098, for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$343 to Dr. H. H. Smith, of Fort Smith, Ark., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for medical services rendered the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army by the said Dr. H. H. Smith under contract No. W-643-eng-2663, dated April 11, 1942, the said Dr. H. H. Smith having fully performed all the obligations imposed upon him by said contract and payment of the above amount having been approved by the Corps of Engineers, but disallowed by the General Accounting Office: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, and it shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys,

either directly or indirectly, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the money hereby appropriated in excess of 10 percent thereof for or on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS LEWIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3189, for the relief of Thomas Lewis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas Lewis, of route 1, Martinsville, Va., the sum of \$1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury sustained by him on October 16, 1941, when he was struck in the right eye by a piece of rock while on a work detail as an inmate of the Federal prison camp at Mill Point, W. Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR H. LOFTUS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3299, for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico, the sum of \$229.50, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid to the Banco de Tampico (Tampico, Mexico) for purchase of a bill of exchange, the Banco de Tampico having been closed by the Mexican Banking Commission before the bill of exchange could be presented for payment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. CHARLES H. MORHOUSE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3329, for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse, Medical Corps, United States Army, for reimbursement of the value of his personally owned automobile which was expropriated by Army authorities on January 14, 1942, at Bataan, Philippine Islands, for use by the United States Army, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed \$350. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$350, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Lieutenant", insert the word "Colonel."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. B. WALKER FUNERAL HOME

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3330, for the relief of R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill (S. 1346) for the relief of R. B. Walker Funeral Home be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the R. B. Walker Funeral Home, Greenfield, Ohio, the sum of \$200 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for funeral services rendered in connection with the burial of the remains of Artie William Benson, apprentice seaman, United States Naval Reserve: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill were laid on the table.

HARRY L. SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3331, for the relief of Harry L. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Harry L. Smith, of Mantec, N. C., for \$236.06, as the amount of damages to his automobile caused by transporting a wounded soldier to a hospital in Elizabeth City, N. C., on February 2, 1942, at the request of a lieutenant in the United States Army and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed \$236.06. There is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$236.06, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPENCER MEEKS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3332, for the relief of Spencer Meeks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Spencer Meeks, the sum of \$3,475, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for damages for permanent injuries sustained on May 9, 1941, when he was struck by a bullet fired from the pistol range of the Savannah, Ga., Air Base of the United States Army Air Force while the said Meeks was performing his duties, as an employee of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., in a building situated beyond the boundaries of the Savannah Air Base: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 307, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation and study of such matters related to present and probable future conditions and developments in and affecting air navigation and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable.

The committee, as a whole or by subcommittee, shall report to the House (or to the

Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to conduct such investigation and study at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, as it deems necessary; except that in conducting such investigation and study outside the United States or at any place in the United States away from the seat of government such committee shall act by a subcommittee of not more than 11 members.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish], and pending the use of that time by the gentleman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which seeks to authorize a general study of the aviation industry in this country. It may be said that we had a select committee for the study of aviation recently, known as the Nichols committee, but I would like to call the attention of the House, and I raise the question of that committee for that purpose, that it was not a committee to study the aviation industry, such as the committee proposed in this resolution, but rather it was a committee to study air accidents.

This resolution authorizes a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House to make a general study of the whole subject of aviation. I realize that there are some in the House who feel that we have entirely too many committees, and to that subject I want to address myself briefly.

We in the Congress are called upon to enact legislation regarding many complicated and complex questions, many questions of a highly technical nature, and we as laymen are not always sufficiently advised to intelligently legislate upon these subjects. We must make a study of these subjects before we can intelligently legislate upon them, and that is the purpose of this committee.

There was a very interesting article in the past week's issue of the United States News by David Lawrence which suggests that each Member of Congress, both Houses of Congress, should have a staff of experts to advise them upon the many subjects that we are called upon to legislate on. I do not know whether I would be willing to go that far, but I do say that the money invested by this Congress in enabling it to make a study of its own is many, many times justified. That is what is proposed by this resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, one of the watchdogs of the Treasury.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman in his opening remarks said that this is a resolution providing for an investigation affecting air navigation in this country. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact it is not limited to this country by any means, either in the first paragraph

or in the concluding words of the resolution.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. It was purely a slip of the tongue, as it were. The gentleman is correct. It is not confined to an investigation of that industry in this country; however, I may say to the gentleman that I understand from those who sponsor the resolution that it is not their purpose to go into foreign fields at this time. I say again to my distinguished friend that I do not know but what that might be justified before we get through. I am sure they do not intend to go into that field presently.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows that we have today over 20 select committees of this House. I think it is a good practice in a matter of this kind, when we are going to authorize an investigation, to let the committee having charge of the legislation make the investigation. There are a lot of committees that come on the floor of the House and tell the House that they are going to be limited in what they will do, but once you get the resolution passed they do not limit themselves. They go all over. It happens that it is up to the committee of which I am chairman to handle the resolutions appropriating the money to carry out the purposes of the resolutions. We are spending more money now by far than was ever spent in the history of Congress for investigations. We have committees that are duplicating work.

Just the other day, the House passed a bill having to do with the disposition of surplus property after the war. Still a few days after, your Committee on Small Business started an investigation of what is to be done with surplus property after the war. The bill is passed and is over in the Senate. It was handled by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. COLMER. Again I want to compliment my distinguished friend. I agree with him that we are spending entirely too much money, but I again call the attention of my friend to the fact that the Congress of the United States, while it authorizes the expenditure of these great sums of money, is not the offender in the spending of this money. What we spend here in the conduct of the Nation's affairs is infinitesimal compared with the good that we accomplish, because we must be advised in the premises before we can legislate intelligently. I am sure that when the sponsors of this resolution appear before my good friend's committee he will see that they do not get too much money, and I hope that they do not.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that I am in sympathy with this resolution.

Mr. COLMER. I thought the gentleman was.

Mr. COCHRAN. I realize what commercial aviation is going to mean after this war. Where we have 1 airfield today we are going to have 10 then. The sky will be filled with planes at the conclusion of this war. This is a most important subject. I may say further that

the resolution that has been introduced providing for the money to carry on this investigation calls for only \$10,000, and I do not believe the chairman of the committee will ask for more at the present time. Mr. BULWINKLE certainly was reasonable in asking for funds at the outset.

Mr. COLMER. I knew the gentleman would agree with me.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I feel obliged to make the observation that it probably may be that my good friend from Missouri thinks that his general committee of investigation ought to do these things.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that while I was absent from the House, ill, the Congress created select committees to do the job that was the duty of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It is my viewpoint that the members of that committee, both majority and minority, including my friend from Massachusetts, slept on their rights, failing to fight the resolutions taking jurisdiction from the Expenditures Committee. Instead of creating select committees they should have gone ahead and done the job the Congress had given them jurisdiction to do. But now about 15 select committees of this House are making the investigations.

Mr. GIFFORD. This enthusiasm is rather recent, is it not?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter from the president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Ernest Ingold, and a resolution adopted by its board of directors with reference to closing down gold mines in the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to address the House out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, as far as I can find out, there is no opposition to this resolution, which empowers the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make investigations of present and future conditions and developments affecting air navigation and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable. It is a comprehensive resolution giving the committee very broad power to investigate the aviation industry and matters affecting air navigation both in this country and outside of America. To some extent it takes the place of a separate or permanent

committee on aviation, which was proposed in the House and defeated a number of months ago. I agree that it is a wise policy to empower the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that deals with aviation, to investigate, instead of having a separate small special committee doing additional investigating work. The members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are competent and experienced, and there is no reason that this policy should not be pursued in this case and in others in the House of Representatives in order to promote efficiency and orderly and constructive investigations and sound legislation.

I have asked for 5 minutes out of order to discuss an important issue that has no connection with the proposed resolution. I introduced today the following House joint resolution authorizing and directing the Stabilization Director to grant an increase of a minimum of 8 cents an hour to all nonoperating and operating railroad employees:

Whereas the President's Emergency Board, after months of hearings, conclusively proved that gross inequalities now exist between railroad wages and wages paid in comparative industries; and

Whereas wages paid to nonoperating employees of the railroads are 25 percent below those in effect in war industries; and

Whereas the President's Emergency Board recommended, in May, 1943, an increase of 8 cents an hour to the 1,000,000 nonoperating railroad employees, reducing existing inequalities and bringing their wages to a level comparative to the increased cost of living; and

Whereas Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson, in direct opposition to the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board, issued a ruling denying the 8-cent adjustment in wages to the nonoperating railroad employees, and has declined to reverse such ruling; and

Whereas the operating employees have been awarded a token increase of only 4 cents an hour to meet the emergency created by the increase in the cost-of-living which is inadequate; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the 8 cents an hour increase in pay to 1,000,000 nonoperating railroad employees, and a comparative percentage of increase to all operating railroad employees, who are contributing loyally and effectively to the war effort by keeping war materials and food supplies rolling to war plants, ports of embarkation, and to consumers at home, is warranted due to the increased cost of living in wartime; and be it further

Resolved, That the Stabilization Director be and he is hereby authorized and directed to grant an increase of a minimum of 8 cents an hour to all nonoperating and operating railroad employees.

Mr. Speaker, a great injustice has been done to millions of nonoperating and operating railroad employees. The Congress of the United States set up through the Railroad Labor Act machinery to settle all matters in controversy, and that was carried out in this case by the railroad employees, who submitted their grievances in a proper and legal way. Finally the President set up an emergency board that again investigated all the facts and recommended an 8 cent an hour increase for all nonoperating railroad employees. That was discarded

by one man, almost in defiance of the Congress, because the Congress set up the Railroad Labor Act and provided machinery for the settlement of disputes. This procedure has been adhered to in every instance. The President's board recommended an increase of 8 cents. However, Mr. Vinson, the Stabilization Director, refused to agree to it.

Therefore, we are faced today with a very crucial situation throughout the United States. There is no more loyal and patriotic group in America than the railroad employees. They have contributed magnificently to the war effort by keeping the wheels rolling so that war supplies, munitions and food could be brought to the ports of embarkation for our soldiers overseas, as well as transporting food for our consuming population.

Now we are threatened with and are possibly on the verge of a Nation-wide strike. There has been no major railroad strike for the past 20 years due to the patience and willingness of the railroad employees to submit their claims to adjudication by tribunals set up under the Railroad Labor Act. Now, because of the gross injustice, which is apparent to everyone who has studied the situation including the Presidential board that recommended an 8-cent increase, we may be facing a strike on American railroads in time of war, a strike that would be legal under the act recently passed by the Congress. The administration should not permit the situation to get out of hand by continuing to ignore in an arbitrary way the just demands of all railway employees for a fair increase in pay. It is a serious matter and one for the Congress to investigate as it comes within the power of the Congress, in view of the fact that the railroad employees acted under a law passed by the Congress and submitted their grievances and claims in a legal manner.

Therefore, I submit that something should be done immediately to adjust these wages and to give this increase of 8 cents that was authorized by the President's Emergency Board set up by the President under the law, so that we shall not even be threatened with any possibility of a strike by the railroad employees who have been acting in good faith and are entitled to a square deal and to fair treatment by payment of adequate wages to both operating and nonoperating railroad employees.

During the last 20 years other industries have had serious strikes, including disorders and violence. On the other hand the Railroad Brotherhoods have stood firm for the settlement of all disputes in a legal way by impartial tribunals under the Railroad Labor Act. The Railroad Brotherhoods have set a fine example for many years by settling their claims by arbitration and through cooling-off processes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute more. I submit that there is no more loyal, patriotic, faithful, or more devoted group in helping to win the war than these American railroad employees. Their sons by the hundreds

of thousands are in the armed forces of the United States today fighting on every battlefield, on land, on the sea, and in the air, but they, too, are entitled to justice here at home; they are entitled to fair treatment and to an increase of 8 cents an hour, which at that is not equal to the increase in other war or comparable industries. The increase of 4 cents an hour to operating railway employees is a mere token and more in the nature of an insult than a proper, fair, and adequate increase to meet the higher cost of living in time of war.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York upon his deserved eulogy of the members of the Railroad Brotherhood.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman knows that every Member of the House, Republican and Democrat alike, knows that the operating and nonoperating railroad employees are 100-percent American and completely loyal and doing a splendid war job day and night and that a great injustice has been done to them and we hope and insist that before any threat or strike develops the matter will be settled on a fair and adequate basis, and that is all that the railroad employees are asking.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

INVESTIGATION TO ESTABLISH OUR FOREIGN AIR NAVIGATION AND WAR-PLANE PRODUCTION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution, but I regret exceedingly that it does not go further, that it has not been made broader, and greater powers given to the committee, because, as I understand it, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will be the chairman of the subcommittee which will make the investigation, and there is no more capable or sincere Member of this House than the gentleman from North Carolina. Many Members here were present when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], chairman of a special aviation investigating committee, made his report upon its investigation, and I know that most Members came to the conclusion that something should be done to safeguard the air interests of our country, against encroachment by those of other countries. I know that other countries are working sedulously to develop and obtain control of air navigation in foreign lands. It is of the utmost importance that we should not lose this opportunity ourselves, as we have heretofore.

Germany is working today through its I. G. Farben cartel to gain nearly complete control of South American aviation, as well as that of other countries of the world. Great Britain, too, some years ago, laid plans for world-wide air transportation, and we should no longer delay in formulating plans and establishing a

policy that will place us in the forefront in world air navigation.

There are other reasons why this resolution should be made very broad. Of course, we have the splendid Military and Naval Committees, but they have not been furnished with the necessary staff personnel or sufficient money to go into extended investigations of the excessive costs and other important and newly developed phases of the subject of world air navigation, construction, and operation.

I think it is an outrage and a shame that we have had so many crashes and terrible accidents. Many of them appear to have been due to faulty plans and defective construction, amounting in some instances to nothing short of recklessness, costing the lives of many.

I am somewhat familiar with the methods of operation of some of the companies now being investigated, having had experience with them during the last war when the construction of planes was delayed until after the Liberty motor had been manufactured and ready to be installed. There was a delay of 9 months. The same group today again is operating in a manner that I think warrants careful scrutiny and thorough investigation. I think this investigation to be conducted by the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will accomplish much good. We should not permit Germany, which is now developing through the form of cartels and penetrating into every nook and corner of the globe, to grab the air commerce of the world. Certainly we must not lose our own opportunities. We have expended billions of dollars and lost thousands of lives, and for what? For freedom and liberty, yes; but it is our duty to preserve and protect our air commerce for the future.

I am in favor of the resolution, but, as I say, I only regret that it does not go further. I hope, after the ground work for this investigation and study is laid, the gentleman will come to the House and ask for greater powers to enable his committee to penetrate and investigate not only the expansion but the operation of all air lines. In fact, it should have jurisdiction and power to investigate faulty and defective constructions and the unjustifiable prices that have been exacted in the building of planes for the armed forces. I am aware that some of the largest corporations engaged in the manufacture of planes, after expending millions upon millions of Government money, have not produced the needed bombers and other types of planes in accordance with the production schedules set up when the Government agreed to advance the necessary funds. Not because they did not have the materials, as in the case of the Ford plant at Willow Run, Mich., where thousands and thousands of tons of material were on hand. And in this instance the materials were obtained by depriving other manufacturers of war items of needed materials and thereby delaying their production. I know that the gentleman from North Carolina,

Major BULWINKLE, has the courage to make an investigation of that situation as well as any other where similar conditions have been found.

Mr. Speaker, some of the Members now charge excessive expenditures and are clamoring for economy. I feel that if this committee has the power it will force renegotiations of the airplane contracts that will bring to the Government the return of thousands of dollars for every dollar it will expend.

It will be remembered that 3 or 4 months ago I delivered several speeches on the floor of the House, the last being on June 30, 1943, when I pointed out that the Army and Navy were reckless in their expenditures, spending millions and millions of dollars unnecessarily. I think that if such a committee as is now contemplated had then been in existence, many of these things could have been avoided. I only regret that the Military and Naval Affairs Committees did not obtain sufficient money, sufficient help, sufficient personnel to carry on the investigation in as fearless a manner as was originally contemplated and was expected would be made. The Truman committee is doing a good job and is greatly taxed in proceeding with investigations of other important war work and it cannot be expected to penetrate the wrongdoings of all the airplane manufacturers. Nevertheless, it is not too late now. I believe that we can still safeguard our interests and course for the future and bring about some economies, and more efficient business methods to displace the haphazard and reckless methods now in practice.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House during the last war I observed the carrying out of the war effort in its various production phases and it is by reason of the knowledge and experience I gained then that I have taken the floor during the past 2 years to direct attention to instances of reckless expenditures and ill-considered administration of War and Navy Department policies and plans.

I well recall in 1917 the meaningless efforts of a Colonel Deeds and a coterie of manufacturers who were collaborating in airplane production and the conditions were such that I was constrained to call them to the attention of the Secretary of War, Mr. Newton D. Baker, and the President.

Of course, after the war there were some prosecutions. What I believe should be done now, Mr. Speaker, is to stop certain practices that have resulted not only in reckless expenditures but in retarding production. We should go further and recoup as much money for the Treasury as possible.

Not that I do not favor criminal prosecution, if the evidence justifies it, of those who have conspired to rob the Government, but appropriate punishment should be meted out to those responsible for faulty or defective construction of planes that has resulted in the loss of the lives of our airmen, saying nothing as to the cost of the planes that have crashed.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel that the aviation subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should also thoroughly penetrate the matter of

the selection of airfield sites, the contracts for the construction of airplane manufacturing plants, and the expansion of established plants, as well as the contracts covering all plane requirements.

Yes; it might also be well to ascertain to what use the expensive blimps have been put to. Over 2 years ago I urged consideration for an appropriation of \$25,000 to complete a flying model of a helicopter that experts declared was practical, but neither the War nor the Navy Departments gave consideration, and, on the other hand, millions upon millions have been spent for experimentation and for the construction of blimps.

Only a few days ago I read that finally a helicopter had been perfected at great cost to the Government. I feel that if consideration had been given 2 years ago to this type of aircraft we would have been in the course of manufacturing helicopters long ago which would have meant the saving of many lives.

Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost confidence that the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will do its full duty in vigorously and impartially delving into the ramifications that have retarded airplane production by some of the companies and that it will quickly investigate and propose suitable legislation with respect to establishing and safeguarding our foreign air navigation interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIKES). Is there objection?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in connection with the understanding reached yesterday between the majority leader and the minority leader, may I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if it is now definite that the so-called fathers bill will not be called up in the House before Tuesday of next week and possibly not until Wednesday?

Mr. MAY. In answer to that I will say that if it does go over until next week, which it now must do, I would prefer that it came up on Wednesday instead of Tuesday, if possible. However, if it is not agreeable for everybody to have it come up at that time I will be willing to have it taken up on Tuesday. I am not contentious about it at all. The meeting tomorrow will be rather brief. It will be an executive session to try to get the bill out, relating to the drafting of men with children.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I think we should not delay that fathers bill any more. I think we should get it in here as fast as we possibly can. Our committee is meeting tomorrow afternoon. In view of that, we will probably arrive at some conclusion and approve the bill

tomorrow. I do not see any reason why we cannot bring it up just as quickly as possible. The fathers are all upset. They do not know whether they are on foot or on horseback.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman understands I am one of the original friends of the fathers. We will get that bill out tomorrow sometime.

Mr. FISH. Could not the gentleman bring it up on Tuesday instead of Wednesday?

Mr. MAY. Well, we could. I said I would not be contentious about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FISH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] saw fit to introduce a resolution to compel Fred Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, to live up to the orders of the special board appointed by the President and to allow the increase of 8 cents per hour to these railroad employees.

In the first place, to allow an increase of only 8 cents an hour was an insult. The increase should have been at least 22 cents an hour as the railroad employees asked. Their request was reasonable in the face of the fact that the cost of living has been soaring upward. If I had been a railroad employee I would have preferred that the special board appointed by the President in place of recommending an increase of only 8 cents per hour had recommended no increase at all.

No employees in any other branch of our industries have been paid less for actual services performed than the railroad employees. No employees have done more for the war effort than they. Yet for some strange reason one individual seems to defy not only the machinery set up by Congress but the decision of the special board appointed by the President.

Mr. Vinson substitutes himself as the all-wise one to delay what Congress intended should be done. He apparently thinks he is bigger than Congress and the Government itself. Of course, he is sadly mistaken. He has become so filled up with his own importance that he had the nerve to offer a compromise of 4 cents an hour. That is adding injury to insult. No man with common sense, not drunk with bureaucratic power, would be foolish enough to expect the railroad employees to accept any such offer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Some of the railroad men have blamed Congress for their situation. In this respect I wish the gentleman would make it clear that Congress has nothing to do with it; that it is in the hands of the administration and the boards created by the President under the law.

Mr. LEMKE. It is true, it is in the hands of the boards created by law. Those boards have acted, and one individual, Mr. Vinson, is defying the board and the Government itself. The time has come for prompt action at the hands of Congress, to find out if that individual pretends to be a little czar. If he does we are going to bring him down to where he belongs.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that he is solely responsible to the President and no other official?

Mr. LEMKE. I assume he is, but the President has a lot of things to attend to and I presume he does not even know now that Vinson exists. I will go further and say that the railroad employees and the people generally have a right to demand that their Government and every person in a responsible position, be as fair with them as they expect us to be with it. I repeat that the time has come for action. Congress must not permit this outrage toward the railroad employees to continue. There is neither reason nor sense to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] 5 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I have today introduced a House resolution requiring the employment of an examining staff to assist the Appropriations Committee. I will read the resolution at this time:

Resolved, That in order to meet the growing demand and the urgent necessity for greater economy and efficiency in the appropriation and expenditure of public funds, each duly authorized subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations (except the subcommittee on appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary) is authorized and directed to employ such examiners and other personnel as the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole, shall deem necessary to enable each such subcommittee to obtain adequate information for the efficient performance of its functions. Such examiners and other employees shall perform their duties under the immediate supervision of the clerk or assistant clerk of the Committee on Appropriations assigned as clerk to such subcommittee. The examiners shall be persons trained and qualified in, and having adequate knowledge of, the organization and financial operations of the executive branch of the Government, and shall, in particular, have knowledge of the way and manner in which appropriations of public funds are estimated and made.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to utilize the examiners and other personnel attached to such subcommittee in the examination and analysis of the records, books, papers, documents, and memoranda (including all data with respect to appropriations already made and appropriations requested) of each executive department or independent establishment (including a corporation with the majority of the stock of which is owned by the United States) which is within the jurisdiction of such subcommittee. The subcommittee on deficiencies in appropriations may, with the consent of any other subcom-

mittee, utilize the examiners and personnel of such subcommittee.

Sec. 3. The examiners attached to each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations shall make reports of their examinations and analyses to the clerk of such subcommittee. Such reports shall be supported with such documents and proofs as the examiners shall deem adequate and proper or as the subcommittee shall require, and shall be submitted to such subcommittee by the clerk thereof on the first Tuesday of each month, and at such other times as the subcommittee may deem necessary.

Mr. Speaker, other Members of the Appropriations Committee and of Congress, as well as myself, have long advocated such reform, and with such examining staffs we can save the taxpayers many millions and possibly billions of dollars. Recent disclosures emphasize the urgent need of such a staff for each subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Any business house of any size has examiners and certainly such expert examiners should be available for the committee members who are responsible for the spending of the largest business in the world.

I plead for quick action and adoption of my resolution, and I hope I can get it because it may well obviate the need for additional taxes, and I hope I can have the support of every Member of Congress in this endeavor to organize for an efficient procedure to stop waste and unnecessary spending of Government funds, in which every American taxpayer is so vitally interested.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the entire statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], but I heard the end of it, and I think I know what he is advocating.

We heard another speech today to the effect that we should have investigating committees to advise the House as to the expenditures of money.

When the Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, specific provisions were included in that act for the Director of the Budget to have an investigative force to check up on every agency to determine whether or not their requests for funds were beyond that which they could get along with; also, in the Budget and Accounting Act, setting up the Office of the Comptroller General and the Accounting Office specific provisions were made for the Comptroller General to make investigations for the Congress. The Comptroller General is the one official of this Government who is the representative of the Congress. He is appointed by the President for 15 years. He cannot be reappointed. But he is not answerable to the President. He is answerable to the Congress of the United States.

A short while back I appeared before the leading members of the Appropriations Committee, most of them members of the deficiency committee, and at that time I had with me the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, and his two first as-

sistants, and others and we discussed the advisability of giving Mr. Warren funds to carry out investigations of the Congress and to report to the Congress only in reference to expenditures where there was waste or extravagance or where money was not being spent for purposes other than specified.

Frankly, I felt that I had sold that idea to the committee. I left the room thinking it would be carried in the next deficiency appropriation act, but to my surprise what came in? An appropriation for the Appropriations Committee to have investigators; \$100,000 was provided for, Mr. Warren received nothing.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a moment. You have the money for the Appropriations Committee to make the investigations, but the proper place in my opinion is in the General Accounting Office under the supervision of the Comptroller General. Three or four years ago we appropriated about \$250,000 and have yearly ever since to provide the Budget officer with an investigation agency, but the Budget Director never gives Congress the information.

Mr. Warren has never received any money for such a setup. If we will give him the money he will make the investigations and he will provide the Congress with information that will enable us to save a tremendous sum. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee are the ones who hear all the testimony from the officials in all Government establishments who come before the committee to get appropriations.

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely.

Mr. JENSEN. We sit for weeks and weeks and finally we bring out an appropriation bill, which first goes to the full Committee on Appropriations for its approval and then it comes to the floor for passage. Then we forget it for a whole year. We have little or no contact, knowledge, or supervision over the expenditure of that money from then on. And, when these agencies run out of money they go before the deficiency subcommittee and get more money, generally speaking, and I am not condemning the deficiency subcommittee because they are also in the dark. This resolution sets up an examining staff for them also.

There is just no way we can have contact with the spending agencies except by having an examining staff directly responsible to and under the supervision of each subcommittee, such staff to be composed of from one to several experts who would be able to lay the facts before us every 30 days or oftener. If we do not now set up such staffs we will just continue to go along from year to year appropriating far greater sums than are needed in many, many cases.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Of course, the gentleman from Missouri is aware of the fact that at this particular time the whole ques-

tion of expenditures of the War, Navy, Maritime Commission, and all of the other executive departments of the Government is an issue in the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 2 minutes.

Mr. MAY. The War Department is taking definite steps to see that in the future the Comptroller General can act. He tells us that he does not even have the money to carry on the investigation.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, if he gives the War Department the power wanted it will be a grave mistake. Give Mr. Warren what he wants. The final audit should come before the final settlement if we are to recover money that was illegally spent.

Now I will say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa who said they should have a chance to get that information by having an investigating committee for the subcommittee—

Mr. JENSEN. I would call it an examining or fact-finding committee for in reality the purpose is to save dollars.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, an investigating committee or an examining committee, Mr. Warren and his office can set up an investigation division for this very purpose, namely, to serve you. Remember only the Congress will get this information for as I said he is a representative under the law of the Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. If he could give us the facts and figures it would be fine but I am convinced that it will never be done that way.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think you will get better results through Mr. Warren. No authorization is needed as far as Mr. Warren is concerned; it is included in the Budget and Accounting Act and has been since 1921.

Mr. JENSEN. I am willing that Mr. Warren exercise his authority in the act for he is an honest, able gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. What good is that if he is not given the money to do so?

Mr. JENSEN. I am willing to give him the money to carry on his lawful duties; it will tie in perfectly with my proposed examining staffs.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then go before the independent offices subcommittee and advocate that when the committee has its hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it pleased me immensely to hear the gentleman from Missouri, my colleague on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, rise and call for an investigation of all these expenditures. I am sure he applauded the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY], when he indicated to the membership of his committee that

at long last the committee would have something to do.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] now, because he, as well as all majority and minority members, slept on their rights by not opposing the creation of about 17 select committees of this House that are doing the work that the gentleman from New York wants to do. Why duplicate it? If the investigations were not going on I would favor the suggestion.

Mr. BENDER. As far as select committees of the House are concerned, I do not know the committees to which the gentleman refers, but certainly this committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, was created for the purpose, the specific purpose, of investigating expenditures in the executive departments. You remember, those of you who are older Members, that some years ago three or four committees of the House were merged into this one. This committee was established, but it was loaded with administration advocates and every investigation proposed was tabled.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have been a member of the committee ever since it was organized; was its chairman for almost 10 years. It was organized when the Republican Party was in power. What is the gentleman talking about? When was it loaded?

Mr. BENDER. I understand about its organization, but I have been a member of it in recent years, and while the gentleman from Missouri was chairman it was never loaded better. The gentleman has always batted 100 percent for the New Deal.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, the gentleman has been an active member, always on hand. The Republican Party might have loaded it with antiadministration favorites, but when I was chairman I never dictated the majority members nor was I ever asked for suggestions.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman from Missouri was always the best engineer the New Deal steam roller ever had. Whatever may be said about the Republican Party in former days, most certainly in recent years that cannot be charged against it, because the Republican Party has not been in control of the House since 1930. Furthermore, expenditures had not reached the sky. Expenditures have risen to such heights that they are way beyond our vision and understanding. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] deserves to be commended for establishing these subcommittees to check into the various departments of the Government. It is high time that the committee be used for that purpose. We have a good committee, and I am sure the gentleman from Missouri will reconsider his opposition to this proposal. I was afraid that possibly the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] was acting without con-

sulting somebody at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. I hope that they do not use the steam roller on him.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. In view of what the gentleman has said, he has admitted that the Committee on Expenditures has been inactive and has not accomplished the purpose for which it was instituted and organized. Did the gentleman hear my resolution?

Mr. BENDER. I heard the resolution of the gentleman, and I commend it. I think all of these investigations are good. Here is a regular committee of the Congress that was established for this specific purpose and we are not fulfilling that purpose because the committee is loaded with administration supporters who refuse to use their power to do a job that needs to be done. We do not need any special committee to carry on this work. We have the regular committees of the House. Whenever there is a special committee like the Tolcan committee established and some administration spokesman disagrees with its conclusions, it is killed. Who told the Rules Committee to pigeonhole the Tolcan committee? What has the gentleman from California, JOHN TOLAN, done to warrant such treatment? The Tolcan committee needs no defense nor does the gentleman from California, JOHN TOLAN. The work of the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] and his committee is one of the outstanding achievements of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

In conclusion, I say again here is a regular committee of the House. Why not use it to do the job that needs to be done? Lindsay Warren yesterday indicated very definitely that such a committee was needed because of wholesale extravagance, the outrageous expenditures that are not helping the war effort. I say it is high time that both sides of this House support the chairman of this committee in his desire to get to the bottom of this whole matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that this investigation we are now authorizing implies an investigation of domestic as well as foreign air commerce. In this connection, I hope that the investigating committee under the aegis of the gallant gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will consider our merchant marine in connection with air transportation. It seems there has always been a disposition to keep the media of transportation separate so that, for example, railroad carriers were precluded from entering into air transportation and steamship companies were proscribed against air transportation, railroads were precluded from bus traffic, and so forth.

Situations are developing daily and will become emphasized after the war which will force us to the conclusion, inevitably, that steamship companies, if

they are to compete successfully with foreign steamship companies, must and should have the right to enter the air-plane field.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to heartily endorse every word that the gentleman says, for when Mr. Kennedy was president or chairman of the merchant marine he made such a recommendation. The Committee on the Merchant Marine went into that and reported a bill that would have provided aviation in connection with ships. There was some pressure somewhere about the time of the formation of this Aviation Board that stymied that bill in the Rules Committee. We had to take out that provision in order to get through other very necessary purposes that could only be accomplished in that way. I do not think there is a gentleman on the Rules Committee today who was responsible for that.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman. We must make a distinction between foreign and domestic commerce. It may be that steamships should not enter the domestic air field, but when it comes to a consideration of, say, the Cunard Line, that is privileged to have airplanes traveling over Africa, Asia, and South America, our companies, in common parlance, would be in the hoosegow and could not possibly hope to compete with the Cunard Line in Africa, Asia, or South America, unless they, like the Cunard, had planes to compete with Cunard planes.

The same thing would apply, for example, to the French Line in Syria, Palestine, and Lebanon, in two of which countries the French is the mandate power. If we tried to compete with the French Line in the Mediterranean and we have not airplane transportation supplemental to our steamship transportation, again we will be in the doldrums. The French Line would beat us to the punch. The same would hold true with reference, say, to the Holland lines in the East Indies, Hong Kong, and India. Preservation of American steamship routes may require the aid of planes.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am very much interested in the statement that the gentleman is making. There is a company out on the Pacific coast that has steamships operating between the Hawaiian Islands and the mainland of this country, the Matson Navigation Co.

Mr. CELLER. That line certainly should have the right to supplement its steamship lines with air transportation. Weather conditions might preclude a steamship from going along a certain route, or it may wish to hasten the transportation of certain types of freight and it should have the right to use planes in that respect. Assuredly some foreign steamship line might easily force our American ships off the water, if in addition

to ships they had planes flying from San Francisco, the gentleman's city, and Hawaii, whereas our line would be sans ships.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much. May I say further that this Matson Navigation Co. started in with sailing vessels, developed the business, and now that air transportation has been developed it should be permitted to have the franchise.

Mr. CELLER. A company like that should have consideration in that respect.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the objection to doing that very thing? Will the gentleman enlarge upon that subject?

Mr. CELLER. In the Railroad Carrier Act, for example, there is a proscription and the various entities having control over transportation, be it water, air, or land, have carried out that proscriptive idea that was laid down in the statute originally that there should not be possible monopolies through two media of transportation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to airplanes, the airplane being a new invention, it was felt that there should not be the specter or the danger of railroads or steamship companies husbanding to themselves the possibilities of the new invention, namely, the airplane. There was always the fear of monopoly, there was always the fear that rose out of the horrors and the sordid tales of the old railroad days, and that sort of hangs over the airplane industry today. We have put those proscriptions in various enactments, but when it comes to foreign commerce I think we should pull them out. We want free and open competition, we want no monopolies, be it on land, sea, and air, or combination of any of the three. But we can still have competition and allow steamship companies to apply for air franchises over foreign land. The right to apply to some Federal body should exist and if public convenience and necessity exists the franchises for air routes should be granted.

Mr. BLAND. Another trouble was that the very time we were trying to press this matter before the Rules Committee, because I want to be just to them, there was the possibility that on account of the conflict between different and varying interests in the commercial field, particularly the foreign field, we would not get anywhere either with the steamship operations or with the commercial operations. The bill that was passed has done a great deal of good though.

Mr. CELLER. Let us take the Grace Line, which covers South America. It could not possibly continue in competition with say the Swedish lines, or other foreign South American lines which cover many of the South American ports,

if the Swedish or other steamship companies could have airplanes and the Grace Line could not.

Take the Isthmian Line, which covers far-distant ports like New York, San Francisco, Hawaii, the Philippines, China, Singapore, and places in Africa and England. They could not possibly compete with the Cunard Line or a North German Lloyd Line, or a Norwegian line, or the French Line unless upon a competition basis; so that we must accord them the same type of privileges and immunities that the foreign governments accord to their particular nationals or companies.

I quote from a splendid ad of the United States Lines:

In 1918, almost anyone would have told you this country never would be caught again without a merchant fleet sufficient to take care of its needs in war and peace. Yet, during the intervening years until Pearl Harbor, considerable opposition had met almost every proposal to strengthen our merchant marine.

American steamship companies had to operate in face of the stiffest kind of world competition for years after the First World War. However, they kept the American flag flying on merchant ships despite handicaps and the competition of foreign companies which enjoyed large government subsidies, lower wages, and other advantages.

We must now render every aid to our American steamship lines in the interests of our strong and ever-growing merchant marine. The airplane may be necessary for the strengthening of that merchant marine. The United Fruit Lines, with their great white fleet, covers Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Cuba, and Jamaica. If a competing foreign company can trace its air lines into the interiors of these pan-American countries, the United Fruit Lines should have a similar right. At least our Government should not prevent them from having equality with foreign competitors. It were absurd otherwise. The American-Havana Steamship Co. operates ocean freight services between various Atlantic and Pacific coast ports and Habana. That line would be driven off the map by some Portuguese or Spanish company if it did not have planes, and the Portuguese or Spanish line did have air franchises. The I. F. C. Lines cover Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, and New York. It may wish to further its interests by the air line across Brazil, or by an airline up and down Argentina. It may not wish to do this. It should, at least, have the right either to procure such a franchise for such air route or routes or to enter into an agreement with another company that may own an air line or lines to work them jointly. There is the Atlantic Gulf & West Indies Lines covering Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other West Indies. There are the Moore-McCormack Lines, the United States Line, the Robin Line, the American Export Lines, the American-South African Lines, and others. The ships of these lines anchor in the ports of the seven seas. If they need airplane help, they should have it. Airplanes may be

essential to supplement our merchant marine to the end that our flag may fly the seas as in the days of the clipper ships, as in the days of the brigs and brigantines, in the spirit of Admiral Perry and Capt. John Paul Jones.

The American shipping industry has done a remarkable job. It has built veritable bridges of ships to all the theaters of combat operations. Those bridges shall not be destroyed as they were directly after the last war. Plans must be laid now to keep that immense merchant marine afloat. Those plans must be realistic, not idealistic. The airplane may be one of the aids to that realistic approach.

Of course, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. It may be that existing or future airplane companies may likewise find it essential for them to apply for steamship-line franchises. So be it. That reciprocity would be a small price to pay in order to protect and augment our present merchant marine.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] to speak on the resolution.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I do not speak in criticism of the purposes which this resolution would serve. I am completely convinced that the subject should be investigated by a competent agency of this legislative body. But I do question the propriety of creating a committee from the membership of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for several reasons.

If this subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should enter upon and become involved in an extended investigation of aviation problems in the light of conditions existing in all parts of the world, the remaining members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might not be able to function in their absence, because an absence of but two of the remaining members of the parent committee would leave it without a quorum. Any person who wanted to block any legislation under such circumstances could do so by merely raising a point of no quorum. This is one of the most important committees of the Congress of the United States. Do we want to subject this great House committee to this possible difficulty during the absence of this subcommittee?

Another objection to the resolution arises out of the fact that the resolution does not insure to the committee the power to issue and to direct the service of subpoenas. Any witness asked to appear before the committee who did not choose to come could snap his fingers at the committee and go about his business with impunity.

A third objection to the resolution as presented to the House arises out of the fact that the resolution itself carries no authorization for the expenditure of public funds or for the incurring of any expenses which the subcommittee might incur.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman knows that that comes up in the second resolution, which goes to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman from California is not at all certain about that. A resolution subsequently presented could carry an appropriation of money provided there was a preceding authorization of such appropriation, or such an authorization is necessarily implied. The legality of such an appropriation should not be left in such an uncertain condition insofar as future action of this House is concerned.

These are three very potent reasons, I think, why this resolution in its present form should not be adopted by the Congress of the United States, at least, not until it is appropriately amended.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to ask the gentleman in charge of this resolution a question, in order that there may be a clear understanding on the floor.

I have been told privately that this resolution would not be used as a means of bringing in a recommendation to extend to aviation the same territorial freight-rate differential that exists in the railroad freight-rate structure of this Nation. I hope the gentleman can assure us that that is not the purpose of authorizing this investigation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I can say to the gentleman that is not the purpose. I have never heard any rumor one way or the other about it.

Mr. POAGE. Let me understand the gentleman. He says that is the purpose?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I say it is not the purpose to go into anything like that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIKES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PETROLEUM CRISIS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to address myself to the question of the serious petroleum crisis now confronting this country. I come not as an alarmist—it is not my purpose to cry "Wolf! wolf!" But I am gravely concerned with the rapidly depleting American crude-oil stocks and supplies.

A half dozen responsible committees of the Congress have investigated the situation. The Petroleum Administration for War has investigated the situation. The Petroleum Industry War Council has investigated the situation. All responsible and informed persons looking into the petroleum problem of this country have come to the conclusion

that something must immediately be done to increase crude-oil production and supplies. It seems that the only agency of the Government that disagrees with this conclusion is the Office of Price Administration. O. P. A., like the private in the Army, thinks everybody is out of step but itself.

There are certain admitted facts in this case. It is admitted that since January 1, 1938, we have consumed more than seven and one-half billion barrels of crude, while we have discovered only something like four and one-half billion barrels of crude.

It is admitted that if our consumption continues at this rate, and consumption will doubtless increase rather than decrease, and if our discoveries continue at this rate, and discoveries will decrease rather than increase, then within a comparatively short time we shall have completely exhausted our reserves of crude petroleum.

It is further admitted that in 1937 there were drilled 31,106 new wells; in 1941, 29,070; in 1942, 17,934; and during the first half of 1943, 7,823.

In other words, the number of new wells drilled—the wildcats—have been decreasing rapidly from year to year. Furthermore, the percentage of discoveries through drilling has decreased. The percentage of failures in 1941 was 24, in 1942 it was 31, and in the first 6 months of this year it was 34 percent. In 1939 the cost of discovering oil, in barrels, was approximately 12 cents a barrel, and in 1942 the cost of discovering oil per barrel amounted to approximately 40 cents, and yet the price of crude oil during all this time has not increased.

I give you now a few figures of average wholesale prices, according to the index of commodity prices, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the month of June of this year. This is based on a par of 100 for the year 1926. All commodities, 103.8; farm products, 126.2; food, 109.6; hides and leather products, 117.8; textile products, 97.4; fuel and light materials, 81; metals and metal products, 103.8; building materials, 110.6; chemicals and allied products, 100; household goods, 102.8; miscellaneous, 91.8. Crude petroleum in the midcontinent field, 59.2; in Pennsylvania, 79.7; in California, 85.2; and in the midcontinent field, gasoline, 56.7.

So, while everything that goes into the production of crude oil has gone up, the price of crude oil has been held down. Assuming that the war is going to continue for several years—and no prudent person can assume otherwise—the amount of crude oil and petroleum products consumed by the war effort will increase. We were told last year—and I think truthfully—that it was necessary to ration gasoline in this country in order to conserve rubber. We are now told that it is necessary to ration gasoline in order to conserve gasoline. In other words, we are now confronted with a real shortage in gasoline.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. FOAGE. The gentleman is raising a point that interests me and my constituents very much, inasmuch as I represent probably the only district in Texas that does not produce any great amount of crude oil. We are simply consumers, and I am terribly alarmed because of the fact that the production of oil is going down, and unless we are willing to pay a reasonable price, which will enable people in the oil business to make the necessary explorations, pretty soon we are not going to be able to buy gasoline at any price. Is not that correct?

Mr. GOSSETT. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FOAGE. And does the gentleman not think it would be better for my people and for other consumers, that we pay a reasonable price and get gasoline rather than that we be told that we can buy a pint a week, and not be able to get it at starvation prices?

Mr. GOSSETT. If the recommendation of the P. A. W. were carried out, and if the price of crude oil were increased 35 cents per barrel, that would amount to an increase in the cost of a gallon of gasoline of only eight-tenths of one cent, provided costs were also prorated among other products manufactured from crude oil. No one should object to this small increase. Better to pay even a few cents extra for gasoline than not to be able to buy gasoline at any price.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement, but is it not a fact that if this price increase is allowed, and carried to other byproducts of petroleum, it would decrease the increase in the price of gasoline?

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman means that it would decrease the increase in price?

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has been interested in this problem for some time, and he will recall that recently a number of us met and a resolution was adopted to carry this matter to Judge Vinson, he being the proper person to appeal to when you want the O. P. A. overruled. Can the gentleman inform the House the result of that request to Judge Vinson, that he overrule the O. P. A. and grant the price increase requested by P. A. W.

Mr. GOSSETT. Several Members of Congress recently went to see Judge Vinson. He has been very courteous, but has not yet indicated when he will hand down a decision, or what it will be.

Mr. CURTIS. But one cannot run a tractor on courtesy, nor buy gasoline in that way.

Mr. GOSSETT. I agree with the gentleman, and that is why I am trying to bring the seriousness of this problem to the attention of the House, because I think 95 percent of the Members of this House feel that something must be done

immediately. If this feeling and conviction is conveyed to O. P. A. and to Judge Vinson in strong enough terms, perhaps we can get desirable action before it is too late.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman have the figures on the amount of stripper wells that are now lying idle because of the fact that the revenue is not great enough?

Mr. GOSSETT. I have some figures. In my district alone there are approximately 15,000 stripper wells or marginal wells, wells producing an average of 3 or 4 barrels per day, most of which are now being operated at a loss, most of which will continue in operation in hopes that an increase in the price of crude oil will be granted. Unless such increase is granted, one-third of those stripper wells will be closed. That is a bird in the hand. The failure of the Government to authorize an increase in the price of crude oil is not only going to discourage exploration but it will absolutely eliminate a great many stripper wells. In other words, we will lose much of our production, as well as fail to get new production. In fact many stripper wells have already been abandoned because they cannot operate profitably under present crude oil prices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The distinguished gentleman who has the floor has given this problem a great deal of careful and diligent study. He has gone into it from various angles. He has attended the meetings of committees of this House having to do with this question and has examined the problem as carefully as any Member on the floor of the House. I believe it would be well to call special attention to the depletion of gasoline supplies and crude oil supplies, by reason of the requirements of our armed forces for gasoline.

At the present time it requires 600,000 barrels of gasoline per day to supply our armed forces. The demand is increasing. According to a statement by Secretary Ickes, it is possible that that demand may run as high as 900,000 barrels during the next year. It will take about 37½ percent of the amount of gasoline that is being used in this country east of the Rocky Mountains just for the armed forces alone. So, this is not just a matter of providing gasoline for home use and consumption, but more important, it is a question of seeing to it that we have a sufficient amount of gasoline for our armed forces to carry on this war. Does the gentleman know of any other way to remedy this situation except by legislation by which we may get a fair increase in the price of crude oil, so the production may be increased?

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his observation. The best way, if not the only way, to get this increased production is to increase the price. The whole problem is now in the lap of Eco-

nomie Stabilizer Fred Vinson. As I stated before, all agencies of the Government, with the exception of the O. P. A., now agree that such an increased price is vital.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It has been suggested by certain officials connected with the O. P. A. that a subsidy be paid for the purpose of drilling new wells.

What does the gentleman think of that suggestion? Personally, I do not think it practical and it will not solve the problem.

Mr. GOSSETT. Now that goes into a problem that I do not have time to discuss; I believe the proposal to deal with this crude oil shortage through subsidies for exploration is fraught with many evils. Even if wildcatting were subsidized it would not touch the problem of marginal wells. Subsidies will not have anything to do with this stripper production we are talking about. We will still lose that, notwithstanding a subsidy program. Frankly I do not believe that a subsidy program will get the job done. I think that is the wrong approach to the problem.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. As a matter of fact, the gentleman probably has more oil wells in his district than any other Member of Congress and has done a good job on this fight to get a higher price for crude oil. The gentleman knows that the industry does not want a subsidy.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is true.

Mr. RIVERS. Is it not known to everybody that most of the discovery of new fields is done by wildcaters—small independent oil operators?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not have the figures, but I do know that about 70 percent of all discoveries are made by independents—that is, by wildcaters.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman knows that unless this price increase is granted they will be eliminated. They will be destroyed, and America will become a dependent Nation rather than an independent Nation with regard to petroleum. Does not the gentleman believe that there are some people in high places who want to import oil instead of developing our own resources?

Mr. GOSSETT. I am afraid there is something to what the gentleman has to say on that point. I know he is entirely correct in his statement that the small independents are being squeezed out of the picture under the present crude prices. Unless these independents can be kept on their feet the oil business in America will become a gigantic monopoly controlled entirely by the major oil companies.

Mr. RIVERS. He is being destroyed despite our efforts. I think the gentleman should be commended for his work in trying to preserve the small oil producers as well as trying to look after the welfare of the country in this matter of petroleum supplies.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I want to commend my colleague again for calling this matter to the attention of the House. The gentleman has been very active in an effort to relieve this situation.

I might say in that connection, that as chairman of the Texas delegation I am speaking for them, the entire delegation from Texas. All Texas Members of Congress from the Speaker on down, and including the gentleman who is now addressing the House, have been very active in their support of some sort of a measure that will bring relief to the crude oil situation.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. THOMASON. The independents who, as the gentleman says, are largely responsible for bringing in new fields, already are going broke or are being gobbled up by the big companies. So, in view of the fact that the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Oil Administration, and everybody else who seem to know the real facts about it, say that the situation is getting critical, it would seem to me that if Judge Vinson is not going to act, there is nothing in the world for the House to do except to pass legislation relieving the situation, and that is what I favor.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman; it may become necessary to legislate on that which should be handled by administrative action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I will state to the gentleman that there are quite a number of other special orders. If there is no objection, the gentleman may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I just want to observe that in my opinion this shortage of crude oil is creating a situation whereby we might and could lose the war. Our whole armies today and all armies are operating with mechanized equipment that require oil, require gasoline, and they are a long way from their objective, and I think we should take no chance whatever, not a chance; and to repeat what has been said, Secretary Ickes has recommended twice now at least that the price of crude oil should be increased to solve the proposition. I agree also that this Congress owes it to the people and to the soldiers at the front to pass some legislation to see that they are not subjected to the hazards of a shortage of the necessary gasoline to operate our mechanized forces.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it may interest the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gossett] to know that it is estimated in the Pennsylvania fields—and talking about stripper wells—that there are about 5,000 wells not on the pump; the leases are being abandoned and sold for junk. Our production is off about 15,000 barrels a day from last year which would be equivalent to about 9,000,000 gallons of gasoline a month, which would greatly relieve this shortage on the eastern seaboard, if available.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reed] and the other gentlemen on the Atlantic seaboard who are now shivering in the cold, that if they had supported us in the building of the canal across the Florida Peninsula they would have had plenty of oil.

Mr. GOSSETT. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I do not agree with him on that. As a matter of fact, unless the price of crude oil is immediately increased, we are not going to have enough oil to go into the barges and pipe lines. The Big Inch pipe line has now been completed from Texas to the eastern seaboard. Another big line from Texas is under construction. These lines have cost \$187,000,000 to the Federal Government; and we are going to have the tragic spectacle of those lines running at half capacity within a very few months unless something is done to increase the production of crude oil.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that all the crude oil is not brought from Texas; a great deal is produced in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas, which could supply the oil requirements for the Atlantic seaboard, and if we had this canal across the Florida Peninsula that would have enabled them to meet the need.

Mr. GOSSETT. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that Texas produces over 50 percent of the Nation's crude, but unless the price of crude oil is increased there will not be enough crude in the whole Nation to supply the eastern seaboard.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I would like to commend the gentleman from Texas for his discussion of this problem. Can the gentleman tell us just when is Judge Vinson expected to render a decision on this question?

Mr. GOSSETT. I have no idea. Of course, we are hoping it will be very soon.

Mr. WORLEY. Has he made any indication, official or otherwise?

Mr. GOSSETT. Not that I know of.

I want to make this observation in conclusion. Not only are all the Representatives from oil States concerned with this problem but Representatives from non-oil-producing States are concerned

with it. It is not a problem of protecting the independent oil industry, although that is involved, the greatest problem is that of producing the necessary crude oil not only to carry on the war but to preserve our domestic economy. Mr. Speaker, unless something is done and done soon we are going to have a complete break-down within a few months in our domestic economy. It is time for action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I had for today be postponed until Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders already entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address made by me before the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped at the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., July 9, 1943, and also some remarks about the address by Mr. Paul Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I hereby will make a blanket yielding not to exceed 2 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times, and a short poem from the New York Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Woodruff of Michigan, asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein certain resolutions of the Iowa State Grange.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the Record and include there-in an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

ANTITRUST SUIT AGAINST SOUTHEASTERN UNDERWRITERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3269 and H. R. 3270 have been introduced in the House along with companion bills in the Senate for the reason that unless such legislation is passed there will soon come before the Supreme Court of the United States an appeal carried by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in an antitrust case against the Southeastern Underwriters Association, a group of fire insurance companies operating in the southeastern portion of the country. The legislation is frankly designed to prevent the Supreme Court from ever hearing this case.

Mr. Speaker, I am against these bills on principle. First, I am against them because I think it is one of the most dangerous precedents I can conceive of to have Congress consider the passage of legislation whose avowed purpose is to prevent a certain case from passing through courts of the country in the normal manner. If such a course is taken in one instance by the Congress, we will in the future be vulnerable to the demands of every conceivable group and individual in the country that we step in with a piece of legislation to prevent a matter in which they may have an interest from being carried to the courts of the country in the way provided by law. It occurs to me furthermore that if such a precedent is set, individuals seeking redress from what they may deem arbitrary action on the part of Government officials might find departments of Government, if the shoe were on the other foot, coming to Congress requesting that we pass legislation to prevent the individual citizen getting into the courts with his case.

Those who have concerned themselves with the growth of administrative law in this country and who express alarm over its extension ought, it seems to me, to be profoundly interested in defeating this legislation.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. Is there any difference in principle between that and bringing in legislation to close the courts under the gold clause?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not sure what the gentleman has reference to exactly; I am sorry.

Mr. GEARHART. Some years ago we brought in legislation and passed it which closed the courts to damage suits by people who had claims under the so-called gold clause.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I was not a Member of the House at that time. The only difference is that that was a piece of legislation that was passed more

as a substantive piece of legislation than this. I do not think there is any question about the repeal of the antitrust laws involved here. In that particular instance there was a question, arguable, perhaps, on two different sides, of the basic governmental policy involved.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman remembers the case?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I do.

Mr. GEARHART. Citizens of the United States who had gold were prevented from entering the courts and collecting the difference in value.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As I remember it, that case was carried to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court upheld the Government's position in the matter.

Mr. GEARHART. On the ground that the congressional action prevented further consideration of the case.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And on the further ground, because I do know about this part of it, that no one had been damaged in the slightest degree for the reason they were unable to show any loss of purchasing power on the money involved.

Mr. GEARHART. That is beside the issue. What is the difference in principle between closing the courts against one class of litigants and closing them against another class of litigants?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I answered the question. If it were desired to come in here with a piece of legislation and to say that such-and-such a provision of law was repealed, it would be a proper thing for the Congress to consider. But I do not think that such things ought to be brought in here at a time when a case is already pending and has passed part way through the courts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to get into this conversation. The Supreme Court at that time made its decision but cursed the proceeding. Put that down.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would be very glad to put that down but I would like to put alongside of it something else.

Mr. GIFFORD. Whatever you please, but that is the truth. They cursed it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If that be true, then the Supreme Court of that day would be on my side of the present controversy and would have held exactly the position which I just set forth.

In the second place, Mr. Speaker, private monopoly is the death of both free enterprise and political democracy. Therefore, freedom for the people of any nation, particularly for our own, must rest upon one of two grounds. The first of these and the one which should be depended upon in every case where it can be effective, is clean and untrammelled competition in various lines of business as a means of protecting the public interest. The antitrust laws of the Nation are the major means we have therefore to inject the element of freedom into the business life of this Nation. The only other manner in which the public inter-

est can be protected, if competition has been destroyed by private monopolies or combinations is by means of governmental regulation. Nor can such governmental regulation begin to be effective in the case of the huge industrial and financial lines of business of the Nation if it is exclusively limited to the States. In other words, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws is in a very real sense the only alternative to a further extension of Federal regulation and control. And the only valid argument that can be advanced by any industrial or financial group against enforcement of the antitrust laws is that it is already subject to effective public regulation.

I cannot vote, Mr. Speaker, to restrict the operation of the antitrust laws. On the contrary I would be inclined to vote for their extension if I believed such extension would be important in preventing monopolistic combinations from depriving our country of the beneficial efforts of vigorous competition in any important line of business or industry.

I am also against these bills on practical grounds. Let me quote in this connection from an editorial by the Honorable Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy of the United States, appearing in his Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer:

The attempt of the fire-insurance companies to be exempt from the antitrust law can be understood from the statements made in the indictment by the Department of Justice. They allege that fire-insurance companies charged \$52,000,000 to policyholders and only returned \$18,000,000 in losses in the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. It also says that in the years 1931 to 1940, inclusive, the companies received \$436,000,000 and paid out only \$197,000,000 for losses.

It is little wonder that, being caught with the goods by monopolistic fixing of rates, these over-rich companies wish to escape punishment for violation of the antitrust law.

They ask Congress, by act, to give them this special privilege and are said to be maintaining a powerful lobby to secure exemption from prosecution by the Department of Justice.

Presumably the Department of Justice figures are correct. At any rate they have not, so far as I know, been challenged. If they are correct, or anywhere near correct, then no more than 40 percent of premiums collected by these companies has been used to pay claims for losses. And if that is true, it would appear to me on the face of things that the premium rates are inordinately high and that if competition were really at work these rates could come down substantially without hurting the companies one bit. This would be, of course, precisely the sort of service which the antitrust laws are supposed to render to the American people.

Another editorial by Josephus Daniels seems to me to sum up this situation very well and to completely answer, in a few lines, the whole States' rights argument that has been injected into this question:

In a speech to a group of State insurance commissioners at Harrisburg, Pa., last night, Governor Broughton made an eloquent plea

for State rather than Federal regulation of insurance companies.

Although the Governor did not mention the bill now pending in Congress to exempt insurance companies from the antitrust laws, the speech will no doubt be construed and cited as support of that bill.

Such a construction would be unwarranted. Federal regulation of insurance companies is not an issue. No one has proposed to substitute Federal for State regulation, although there may be some dissenters to the picture of perfection which the Governor paints for State regulation as it has been applied in the past.

The only issue raised by the pending bill of mixed House and Senate parentage is whether or not insurance companies shall be exempted from a criminal statute applying not alone to them but to all citizens of the United States, corporate and individual. Such exemption would constitute class legislation of the worst sort. The bill should not be given serious consideration.

I am opposed to H. R. 3269 and 3270 which would exempt the insurance business from the scope and operations of the Federal antitrust laws, then, primarily because I believe that if we are to have a free economy at all in the United States our first task is to break the power of monopoly wherever it exists. I find it hard to conceive a situation where I would vote for legislation narrowing the field of antitrust enforcement. On the contrary, I believe that what is needed is a much more strenuous enforcement of antitrust legislation.

The insurance business is the largest single business in the country and as such it requires in many respects closer public supervision rather than immunity from enforcement of antimonopoly laws. There is no supervision of rates in 25 States and only partial control in 9 others. If the Federal antitrust laws are repealed as to insurance the public in these States will be left absolutely without protection against possible discriminatory or monopolistic practices by the companies.

The Department of Justice commenced its action against combinations of certain of the fire-insurance companies at the insistence of scores of aggrieved persons throughout the country.

I have seen many of the complaints received by the Justice Department and they seem to me very serious. I shall have occasion to refer to some of them in a few moments.

Many attempts have been made to overcome monopolistic practices in the fire and marine insurance business. These have usually failed because the approach to the problem was by locality or State rather than on an interstate or national basis. The business of most insurance companies, and of all the larger ones, is predominantly written outside their respective home States. Efforts at reform have generally failed because State legislatures have overlooked the fundamental fact that no fire-insurance company could exist without the reinsurance capacity of other companies.

The essential of fire insurance is uniform distribution of liability; in other words, striking an average to have the same amount on numerous risks. The Insurance Executives Association, the

South-Eastern Underwriters Association, the Pacific Coast Board of Fire Underwriters, and the other great rate-making bodies do not overlook this vital point. One of the written rules of each of these organizations is that no member company shall reinsure the business of a non-member company.

That these insurance companies realize the importance of control of reinsurance is further emphasized by the activities of the Insurance Executives Association or its subsidiary organizations in sponsoring laws in every State designed to make Lloyds reinsurance a nonadmitted asset. Lloyds is the greatest aggregate of insurance capital in the world, and even under war conditions its American deposits alone vastly exceed the assets of any other reinsurance company or group. There is not a major American fire-insurance company which does not have a material portion of its business with Lloyds, and particularly there is not a major American company that does not have its excess and catastrophe reinsurance placed with Lloyds. The State laws prohibiting the use of Lloyds reinsurance as an asset work to the advantage of the board companies. By board companies I mean those fire- and marine-insurance companies which compose the memberships of the monopolistic combinations in those fields. In the main, the board companies are those which have been in business longest and have accumulated the most money. It is, therefore, to their interest to freeze things as they are in order to maintain the present high schedule of rates and inordinate expense allowances to management.

These companies have large surpluses, and when they place reinsurance with Lloyds, as a nonadmitted asset, it merely becomes a bookkeeping charge against their published surpluses.

Thus the Home Insurance Co. of New York can easily place \$10,000,000 in premiums with Lloyds and still have ample surplus, but if a comparatively small independent company wishes to write the business and avail itself of the same reinsurance facilities, the fact that Lloyds is a nonadmitted asset would mean that that company's surpluses would be wiped out and its capital impaired. This is true under the laws of many of the States. Thus, the greatest reinsurance market of all is indirectly kept from the smaller companies.

The second great instrument of control which enables monopolistic controls to work is generally known as separation. The South-Eastern Underwriters Association, for example, which is a company-controlled monopoly operated by the leading companies, employs rating engineers and passes on all basic rating schedules establishing the rates for all classes of business in each of the South-eastern States and also establishes the basic rates for each city or territory therein. Furthermore, it establishes the rates of commission to be paid to all board company agents in every city, town, or district in the Southeast, in addition to requiring uniformity of forms used by each member company.

Through a subsidiary organization, controlled in the same manner, the South-Eastern Underwriters Association arranges all of the inspection and engineering reports of all important risks under its jurisdiction. It has its own loss-adjustment bureau and under its rules all major losses must be settled and adjusted by this bureau and not by the individual company or companies carrying the liability.

Separation enters the picture if any member company writes a risk at a lower rate than that prescribed by the South-Eastern Underwriters Association, pays a commission to an agent higher than that prescribed, or reinsures a nonmember company. Separation means that the offending company will be excluded from the organization, will not be allowed the use of South-Eastern Underwriters Association rating schedules, and that every member company will immediately retire from any agency which represents it.

Since a fire-insurance agent usually needs from 3 to 15 companies to handle his major business, this, in effect, means that the offending company loses its agency plant overnight. Of course, it also means that the agent's business is often ruined and his means of livelihood impaired or destroyed.

Complaints received by the Department of Justice from insurance agents in all parts of the country dramatically demonstrate the impact of this vicious practice. For example, a southern insurance agent writes:

The insurance companies I represent are threatening to close me out because my brother works for me and represents an insurance company that does not belong to their organization. In other words, I must either make my brother give up his business or I must give mine up. My brother could not make a living competing in a market where all his prospects bought cheaper insurance so he got a company, a good company, that would enable him to progress.

This man appealed to the commissioner of insurance of his State for relief but was informed that:

The matter to which you refer appears to be that of contractual relationship between insurance companies and their agents, which is not controlled by the insurance laws.

In concluding his letter to the Department the agent voiced a plea:

I sincerely hope and trust that there is some law in this country of ours that will protect even an insurance agent against the ruthless power of organizations when that power is used to discriminate, throttle, and leave abandoned those who are denied the identical privileges granted in other sections.

The obvious answer was given by another complainant who said: "I know of nothing except the Sherman Act that would control this, and the insurance companies' bill would repeal that act."

A California insurance agent writes:

They—

The board companies—

tried to fine me \$50 for a rule violation. I had placed a policy for my son, who was a nonboard agent, and I kept the commission. They informed me I could appeal the

fine, but would have to pay it first and then appeal. What a chance I would have had. I have letters from the various companies saying that they had to withdraw from my office for this violation, also letters from the Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific regarding the situation.

I was particularly impressed by a letter from the wife of a California insurance broker, who said:

It is high time that the practices of various insurance companies and their boards were investigated and brought before the public's attention. Their attempts to dominate and control the insurance business have worked a decided unfairness on the insuring public.

My husband, who is now overseas serving his country, has worked for 17 years in this city as an insurance broker. He realized many years ago the injustice of a few large insurance companies controlling the business, and laying down rules and charging rates which were to their own advantage, and no one else's.

All the so-called board companies are banded together by membership in the Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific. This board promulgates rates and rules which remove any possibility of honest competition between these board companies at the expense of the insurance purchaser.

These facts you may already have, but I wanted to put in my bit in behalf of my husband who is doing his bit to make the world a better place to live in.

When no agent has the right to contract individually with a board company for the terms on which he will represent it; when his contract is already printed and has been approved in advance by a combination of all board companies; when in order to become a general agent of a board company he must be voted on and accepted by the combination to which the company belongs—is this the liberty on which this Republic was founded? I am in thorough sympathy with an insurance agent representing board companies who recently wrote:

I am not for the bill. It cannot be held in maintaining States' rights that the rights of man can be reduced. The South-Eastern Underwriters Association reduces the rights of insurance agents. They do seek to monopolize and control. States' rights or no States' rights, what I want to know is who looks after personal rights?

A local agent, formerly president of a State association, writes:

We all talk about the profit motive, but I sometimes wonder if that very profit motive hasn't run away with itself in the fire-insurance business. The companies are principally interested in making a profit for the stockholders. The branch office managers and general agents are principally interested in making a profit for the companies, and the agents are, of course, principally interested in their commissions. Who, pray tell me, has been interested in the poor guy that pays the premium?

The large risk can take care of itself. So can, perhaps, those insureds who belong to trade organizations which have paid officials to look after their interests, but the single-shot risk, the little fellow, has had no one to look to but the agent, and the agent has been in no position to help much, even if he were so inclined.

No; I don't think the Federal investigation is going to ruin our business and I don't think it's going to turn into any national scandal. The business is essentially honest

and aboveboard, but there are some things that should be changed and perhaps this is the only way that it can be brought about. We all remember the awful squawk which came from the power companies a few years ago when the Government started after them. Well, they are still doing business and making money, but the public is paying much less for power and the stockholders are going to be better off in the end.

Another Californian wrote:

There are good companies which are not "board" companies, but a licensed insurance broker dare not place his client's coverage with one of them at a less rate, for if he does, no "board" company will do any business with him. It is the greatest and most effective conspiracy in restraint of trade not only against competitors but also against the people since the Standard Oil Trust.

The Insurance Executives Association, to which I have referred, is the nominal head of all fire-insurance organizations in the United States. It was organized in 1931 to unify the action of the four major regional organizations. It has disciplinary authority over each of the original bodies, and appellate jurisdiction where an original body is unable to act effectively. Thus, if the South Eastern Underwriters Association could not control an offending company because of State laws, the Insurance Executives Association would decree national punishment for them. Its rules provide that it may require a company to cancel a policy and withdraw from a State for a definite length of time upon failure to comply with any ruling of the governing committee.

It is interesting to observe that the arguments now being used by the big fire-insurance companies are the same as those which they used as long ago as 1868, with reversed emphasis. At the second annual meeting of the National Board of Fire Underwriters held in New York on February 19 and 20, 1868, the committee on legislation and taxation reported on the first duty assigned to it, namely, proposing some practicable plan to rid the country of unfair State legislation, and of securing, if possible, one general law for the governing of insurance companies throughout the Union. The committee reported that there was then before the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Committee on Commerce a bill for the creation of a national bureau of insurance, whose primary purpose was to secure the relief to which the business of insurance is entitled. The committee also urged the necessity for a test case in opposition to the most monstrous exactions of some of the States and to obtain the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States thereon, with the view to settle forever the unconstitutionality of all such unequal and proscriptive State legislation. During the preceding year, the executive committee of the national board of fire underwriters was advised that the underwriters' agency of New York had some time since determined to test the constitutionality of such laws, and that it had taken a case from the State of Virginia to the Supreme Court of the United States involving, it is believed, every important point on the subject.

This was the now celebrated case of *Paul v. Virginia* (8 Wall. 168). When it exploded in the laps of the insurance companies, their bill, which it was designed to aid, died in committee. Now the positions are reversed but the technique is unchanged. Ignoring the antagonism to State legislation which they maintained for half a century or more in the face of an indictment charging them with conspiracies in restraint of and to monopolize interstate commerce, a Federal offense, the insurance companies now swear allegiance to the very States whose laws they repudiated. In this Janus role, they have brought forth a bill to oust the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and thus prevent the Government's case from ever being heard.

The cry of States' rights raised by the insurance interests to conceal the real purpose of these bills is unsound in law and in fact. First, as evidenced by a long line of Supreme Court cases there is no basic inconsistency between the existence of a Federal power and the exercise of a State regulatory power, in the absence of the Congress having preempted the field by specific regulatory legislation. This is further exemplified by the recent case of *Parker v. Brown* (317 U. S. 341), holding that a State authorized program restricting competition is not contrary to the Sherman Act. Second, the argument that existing State regulation is wholly inconsistent with the Sherman Act and the philosophy of free enterprise, is not borne out by an examination of present State legislation affecting the insurance business.

The basic device through which fire-insurance rates are determined and promulgated is that of private rating bureaus. These bureaus are established and operated in 43 States by combinations of the fire-insurance companies themselves. The laws of 22 States permit the insurance companies to operate rating bureaus, but of these, 7 States have antitrust or anticompetitive laws prohibiting rate-fixing agreements. Twenty-one States have no laws applicable to insurance-rating agreements. Two States prohibit privately operated rating bureaus altogether and, in addition, have antitrust laws embracing insurance. In 3 States the control of rate making is an official function of government. Two of these also have insurance antitrust laws. In all, 17 States have antitrust laws designed to prohibit rate-fixing agreements among fire-insurance companies. Furthermore, the laws of no State, except Texas—which establishes maximum rates only—prevent any insurance company from individually determining and charging its own rates. Thus, at a glance it is clear that instead of being in conflict with State laws, the Federal antitrust laws are rather in aid thereof and that the contention is unsound that the principles of State regulation are incompatible with the philosophy of free enterprise exemplified by the Sherman Act. State regulation of rates, where it exists, has the same objective as the Sherman Act but the trouble is that such local regulation, while salu-

tary as far as it goes, is powerless to deal effectively with restraints in operations concerning more than one State and in interstate commerce.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think that Government officials would render the same services under any social-security scheme for less money?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think that is involved in this question at all, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is kicking about the high cost of insurance, or high premiums.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would kick about any cost that I felt was higher than fair competitive conditions ought to place it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about the cost that the Government imposes on us, for instance, through the O. P. A.? The gentleman is not objecting to that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I made a rather exhaustive speech here on the floor on September 23 in reference to the O. P. A. and pointed out in that speech that in my opinion the O. P. A. had, in some cases, actually increased the margins between what farmers receive and what consumers pay for foods.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am always here when the gentleman is talking, always.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is here a good many times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The only trouble is I try to take too much of your time and I apologize, but let the words of wisdom flow forward.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not want the gentleman to apologize. I am trying to make a consecutive speech, however, and would like to get on with it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say to the gentleman that I hope he will stay on this subject because there are a great many of us in the insurance business who are interested in it. Thus far the gentleman is making a good statement and I am interested in it. In addition to what he has already said I suggest that when the gentleman revises and extends his remarks he include the entire last issue of Best's Insurance Manual which will confirm what he has said about the amount of losses on fire-insurance policies all over the United States.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate very much the gentleman's contribution. I have only one more point I am going to make at this time.

My final argument against this legislation concerns the inevitable practical effect of its passage. If Congress should enact these bills our action could hardly, I think, be interpreted in any other way than as a direct invitation to the fire-insurance business to go ahead and en-

gage in monopolistic practices. To declare the antitrust laws do not apply to an industry or a line of business means, does it not, that we do not care if there is monopoly in that business. Does Congress want to say that? Well this Member of Congress certainly does not. And I cannot believe others do either.

This is not an issue of Federal regulation or bureaucracy. It is an issue of whether or not monopolistic practices are to be allowed and encouraged by act of Congress. Enforcement of the antitrust laws is the only alternative to regulation and control—not a first step in that direction.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I read in the paper just a very short while ago an article by a very well-known columnist who stated that a slush fund of \$700,000 had been collected to pass this legislation. Certainly nobody with an ounce of sense would think that money will secure the passage of legislation here. It did not do it in connection with the Holding Company Act.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. I was wondering if that had ever been denied.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know. I want to say several things about that, if I may. In the first place, I think the gentleman is eminently correct when he suggests that the expenditure of a large amount of money either to pass or defeat a piece of legislation in this body will inevitably boomerang and cause precisely the opposite result from that desired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know the gentleman probably has the same experience that I do when any group or individual comes in my office and attempts to make threats about the consequences that will result to me personally if I do not vote for or against a certain piece of legislation. My inevitable reaction is to say to myself, Am I a man or a mouse? If I am a man, I will do just the opposite of what people tell me to do who talk to me that way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not mean that, does he?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I do. I mean that I have that tendency. I do not say I always do it, because I try to do what I believe is right. I hope I would do that even if people were trying to force me to do it. But I say that when somebody comes along and tries to threaten a Member of Congress, the natural reaction of that Member of Congress, if he is a man of principle, is to lean over backward in the other direction.

The next point I want to make is that I do not personally object in the slightest degree to having people engaged in a certain line of business or interested in a certain kind of activity coming to see me to argue their case. I think it is part and parcel of our democratic system. I have a great many very fine friends who

are engaged in the insurance business. Some of them have been to see me to discuss this bill. I appreciated their coming. I was glad to consider the points they had to make, and they were very decent about listening to the points I had to make. I have made this speech subsequent to such conversations, and I feel my position on this matter is sound.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. In connection with the gentleman's remarks, has he inserted anything in the Record with reference to the life-insurance companies? They are involved in this picture and they are still competitive, and they are growing and are sizable and are getting along very well with State regulation and free competition on rates.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have not injected anything into my speech about it, I may say to the gentleman, but I appreciate very much his having brought that up because it is my understanding—and the gentleman can perhaps correct me if I am wrong—that the life-insurance companies have very definitely refused to go along with this legislation and have separated themselves from it. Is that true or not?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not believe that is entirely correct, but I do think it is entirely correct to say that thus far the life-insurance companies have taken no attitude on it. If they felt they were the subject of attack, I think very properly they would be here, but thus far there is nothing in this legislation that interests the life-insurance companies. They believe in competition as to rates. They believe very firmly in State regulation, as I do. But the very point the gentleman makes is an extremely good one, that if we refuse to have competition we inevitably bring ourselves under Federal regulation. I think that all the people in the insurance business who do not want Federal regulation—and as president of a small insurance company I am one of them—believe that we must continue to have some sort of competition or we shall find ourselves under the Federal Government.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to my distinguished and very able and conscientious colleague from New Mexico, and I know he speaks from long experience in this very line of business. He has emphasized one of the two main points of my speech and I thank him very much.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair

recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] for 10 minutes.

A BILL FOR THE INCORPORATION OF THE MOTHERS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to inform the House that on October 12 I introduced a bill to incorporate, by an act of Congress, the Mothers of World War No. 2. This bill is H. R. 3435, and it is now pending before the Judiciary Committee.

The mothers of the boys and girls who are now serving, have served, or will serve in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and in the various auxiliaries and branches thereof, have already organized in many of the States under the guiding hand of Mrs. Gretta Roush, of Indiana, who is serving as their national president during the initial year of this organization. Many local units have already been organized in many States, and the work of organizing additional units in every State of the Union is now in progress. With a potential membership among the mothers, stepmothers, and foster mothers of those who serve in this war, which is far greater than that during any other period in our Nation's history, this organization is charting a course which will redound to the honor and glory of our Nation. This organization of mothers has outlined its objects and purposes which is both laudatory and commendable. In the short space of time allotted to me today I cannot go into all of the details of this proposed legislation, but for the moment I desire to call the attention of the membership to only a few statements contained in the aims and purposes of this praiseworthy organization, all of which are set forth in the pending measure, and I quote them in part and briefly:

To maintain the ties of fellowship born of that service and to assist and further patriotic work in our country; to unite fraternally all mothers who have or have had, or may have, sons or daughters in the service of the military or naval forces of the United States, or its allies, during World War No. 2, who have the will and desire to work with and for those sons and daughters in maintaining both morale and courage and to aid in perpetuating the American way of life; to aid and assist in teaching the advantages of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the duties and obligations of citizenship; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to aid and assist all those who have suffered injury or disability during the war; to foster and promote good will and understanding among the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the mothers of the boys and girls who are bearing the brunt of battle in this war have a common cause and an abiding interest in maintaining and perpetuating the ties of fellowship which are born in that great service; they have a fervent desire to promote and further every patriotic endeavor within the confines of our land. They have made great sacrifices during this tragic war. Some of them have placed upon the altar of war their own flesh and blood—they have given their all—the greatest sacrifice one can make for her country. It is their fervent desire to weld into an organization their united

efforts in order that they may render greater aid to our complete victory in this war, and that they may render all possible aid in healing the wounds of the disabled when this frightful war is over. These mothers desire to give their united aid during the period of this war and, after this war is over, to our fighting forces and to our country; and, may I ask, who is better equipped to render that outstanding service than the mothers of those who serve?

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that all Members may carefully read and give diligent study to this pending legislation, and it is my hope that this measure will receive a prompt and favorable report from the committee, and that when it comes on the floor of the House it will receive the unanimous support of the membership.

That all may read the pending measure, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include herein at this point in the RECORD a copy of such proposed legislation:

H. R. 3435

A bill to incorporate The Mothers of World War No. 2, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers, and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons, namely: Mrs. Gretta Roush, founder, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mrs. Ruby Dinwoodie, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Cora Maybaum, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Ethel Martin, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Robert Usher, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. J. W. Whitlow, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Bernice Kewley, Geneseo, Ill.; Mrs. Reta McDonald, Elkhart, Ind.; Mrs. John Lind, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Bernice Kewley, Illinois; Mrs. W. B. Jones, St. Joseph, Mich.; Mrs. Marian Scott, Wellston, Ohio; Mrs. Lola M. Agal, Bellflower, Calif.; Mrs. Gertrude Warlick, Valentine, Nebr.; Mrs. B. F. Kinman, Williamstown, Ky.; Mrs. Bertha Clow, Kahoka, Mo.; and Mrs. Georgia Kellogg, Hutchinson, Kans., and their associates and successors duly chosen are hereby incorporated and declared to be a body corporate is a national association of women, who are the mothers of the men and women who have served, are serving, or will serve in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps or any auxiliary or branch thereof during World War No. 2, by and under the name of The Mothers of World War No. 2, and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession with the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

SEC. 2. The persons named in section 1 of this act, and such other persons as may be selected from among the membership of The Mothers of World War No. 2, an association of women whose sons and daughters served the Allied cause in the Great World War No. 2 between the dates of December 7, 1941, and the termination of such war, are hereby authorized to meet and complete the organization of said corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and to do all other things necessary to carry into effect the provisions hereof, at which meeting any person duly accredited as a delegate from any local or State organization of the existing organization known as The Mothers of World War No. 2 shall be permitted to participate in the proceedings thereof.

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of this corporation shall be as follows: Founded on our faith in God, the Constitution of the United States of America, and the national traditions that gave birth to our Nation of free people banded together for the purpose

of enjoying life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and living under a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, will aid in keeping alive the spirit that prompted world service in World War No. 2; to maintain the ties of fellowship born of that service, and to assist and further patriotic work in our country; to unite fraternally all mothers who have, or have had, or may have, sons or daughters in the service of the military or naval forces of the United States, or its allies, during World War No. 2, who have the will and desire to work with and for those sons and daughters in maintaining both morale and courage, and to aid in fostering and perpetuating the American way of life; to aid and assist in teaching the advantages of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the duties and obligations of citizenship; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to aid and assist all those who have suffered injury or disability during the war; to foster and promote good will and understanding among the nations of the world.

SEC. 4. The corporation shall hold its meetings at such time and place as the incorporators or their successors shall determine.

SEC. 5. The corporation hereby created shall have the following powers: To have succession until the membership, as hereinafter provided, shall become extinct, with power to sue and be sued in courts of law and equity; to receive, own, hold, use, and dispose of such real estate and personal property as shall be necessary for its corporate purposes; to adopt a corporate seal and alter the same at its pleasure; to adopt a constitution, bylaws, and regulations to carry out its purposes, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or of any State; to use in carrying out the purposes of the corporation such badges and emblems as it may adopt; to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business; to establish State, Territorial, and local subdivisions if it so elects; to publish a magazine or other publications, and generally to do any and all such acts and things as may be proper and necessary to carry into effect the purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 6. All of the real and personal property and funds of the corporation held or used for the purposes hereof, pursuant to the provisions of the act, shall, so long as the same is so used, be exempt from taxes by the United States or any Territory or District thereof. This corporation shall not accept, own, or hold, directly or indirectly, any property, real or personal, except such as may be reasonably necessary for carrying out the purpose of its creation.

SEC. 7. The membership in this organization is limited to women, and no woman shall be or become a member of this corporation unless she is a citizen of the United States, and unless her son or sons, or daughter or daughters of her blood, or that she stand in the relation of a stepmother to those who serve in this war, or that she is a foster mother, after legal adoption, of a son or daughter, who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, or some auxiliary or branch thereof, or in the military or naval service of its allies, during the Great World War No. 2, at some period between the 7th day of December 1941, and the date of the termination of such war, both dates inclusive, he or she having an honorable discharge from such service, or who is still in the service.

SEC. 8. This organization shall be nonpolitical, and as an organization it shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office.

SEC. 9. The corporation shall, on or before the 1st day of January in each year, make and transmit to the Congress a report of its proceedings for the preceding calendar year,

including a full and complete report of its receipts and expenditures. Said report shall not be printed as a public document.

Sec. 10. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, the corporation shall file in the office of the secretary of each State the name and post-office address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom local process or demands against The Mothers of World War No. 2 may be served.

Sec. 11. This charter shall take effect upon its being accepted by a majority vote of the incorporators named herein, who shall be present at the first meeting of the corporation, due notice of which meeting shall be given to each of the incorporators named herein, and a notice of such acceptance shall be given by said corporation, causing a certificate to that effect, signed by the president and secretary, to be filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the city of Washington, D. C.

Sec. 12. Congress may from time to time alter, repeal, or modify any and all laws with respect to this incorporation, but no contract or individual right made or acquired shall thereby be divested or impaired.

Mr. Speaker, this war is not yet over. While it is our fervent hope that victory will soon be ours, yet that happy day has not yet arrived. We must win this war as quickly and as completely as possible. This great organization of mothers, after it has been duly and properly incorporated by an act of Congress, will go forward as a united force, waging the fight for the better things in our country, instilling a finer morale and an undaunted courage among our fighting forces and our people, and rendering that timely aid which will be lasting as a contribution to our ultimate victory, and, when the war is over, to aid in healing the scars of war when victory comes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for 15 minutes.

COMPENSATION FOR SHIPS PURCHASED, CHARTERED, OR INSURED BY WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, lately a Washington newspaper published the announcement that the President has appointed three Federal judges to act as a special board of review on just compensation for ships purchased, chartered, or insured by the War Shipping Administration for war purposes. The President appointed Judge Hand, of New York; Judge Parker, of North Carolina; and Judge Hutcheson, Jr., of Texas.

NO DOUBT THEY ARE CAPABLE MEN

I am interested in these appointments and the creation of this review board from the standpoint of the institution of Congress and the legislation of the last great deliberative body in the world. In the first place, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, section 902, as amended, provides the formula for just compensation to the shipowners for the ships requisitioned by the Maritime Commission. That law is in full force and effect today.

On June 10, 1943, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House had before it for hearings H. R. 2371, which its chairman says is a bill to fa-

cilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under said act. I called the clerk of the committee this morning and learned that the Merchant Marine Committee has not made any report or public findings on the bill as a result of the hearings and there is no legislation recommended by the committee on the subject matter for the Congress to act upon.

Numerous ships have been requisitioned, chartered, and insured by the Government and the question of value revolves around three dates. Admiral Land has stated the date controversy on June 10 before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as follows:

The Comptroller General has ruled that the causes necessitating the taking developed on September 8, 1939. War Shipping Administration believes that the causes did not begin to develop until late in 1940. The owners feel that the causes did not develop until the general emergency was proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or perhaps not until after December 7, 1941.

This controversy of dates, the controversy of values, notwithstanding the positive mandates of the Merchant Marine Act, has existed from the date of the first taking of ships for use in this war. If there is anything wrong with section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended, this Congress should legislate on the matter and directly meet the issues.

I am disturbed from the standpoint of the integrity of the Congress of the United States by the following pertinent chronology of facts:

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, puts upon the Maritime Commission the responsibility of determining and paying the proper and statutory values of ships taken for national emergency and the war. The Maritime Commission is a five-man Commission.

In February of 1942 the President, by Executive order, created the War Shipping Administration and transferred to it certain powers vested by the Merchant Marine Act in the Commission—among them, some of the functions of determining the value of ships taken for emergency and war purposes.

Admiral Land, as head of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, has not followed the ruling of the Comptroller General with reference to the payment of just compensation. Shipowners have written to me and have stated that they have not gotten their money for many months after their ships were taken for emergency and war uses. As head of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, Admiral Land apparently does not see the justice of the law or the date of September 8, 1939, set by the Comptroller General as the basis for arriving at a just compensation for ships taken and is a ready witness on indirect methods to amend the law or to skirt it.

On June 10 and 11, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held hearings on H. R. 2371 and has not recommended legislation. During the week of October 11, the President appointed Judge Hand, Judge Parker, and

Judge Hutcheson, Jr., to act as a special board of review on the just compensation.

The chronology of facts to me presents a very plain case of dissatisfaction with the plain provisions of the Maritime Act of 1936, as amended. The Maritime Commission has the power to set values. It has the power to requisition ships at those values. If the values are inadequate for the ship owners, the plain language of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, provides the shipowner may accept 75 percent of the amount determined and offered by the Maritime Commission and then sue for whatever amount they consider proper. Questions that come into my mind after this factual chronology are: Why has the Maritime Commission not set values and offered them? Why not let the shipowners and the shipping interests bring their cases into the courts to test the constitutionality of section 902-a as amended? Why is Admiral Land testifying that section 902-a involves a constitutional question?

It is hard to understand why the Maritime Commission fears that the shipowners will sue their claims in court. It is further hard to understand why the Maritime Commission does not carry out its duties providing values in accordance with the plain terms of the statute. If the Congress in 1936, enacting the Merchant Marine Act, and later Congresses in amending it are to be repudiated now in World War No. 2, why do not we positively amend the act?

Without any further explanation to enlighten me, it seems to me that the stage is being set for circumvention of section 902-a of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, without repealing or amending the law now. The Maritime Commission is given a definite formula by this section and if the Maritime Commission is not doing its duty, the members should be removed rather than keeping them on the job and appointing an advisory board to review their work or referee their findings of values.

I am terribly distressed at new boards and commissions and bureaus appearing overnight through Executive fiat or claiming the authorization for their birth in the War Powers Act. To me, it all adds up to a comprehensive question, Shall the Congress of the United States become impotent by attrition of Executive orders, boards, bureaus, and commissions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] for 10 minutes.

SUBSIDIES AND FARM PRICES

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the other day the Commodity Credit Corporation bill was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee. This bill continues the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of 2 years after the war. I do not think anybody has any quarrel with continuing the life of this Corporation. The controversy is entirely on one

section of the bill, section 3. If the bill as it is reported is enacted and becomes a law it will be unlawful for any maximum or ceiling price to be placed on any food commodity which is less than the support price.

In other words, section 3, as it is written, destroys the possibility of using subsidies in the production and consumption of food. There is merit in the contention of those who oppose the use of subsidies. Subsidies have two vices, I believe. One of them is that they tend to disguise from us the actual cost of production and are rather inclined to make us go along in a fool's paradise, oblivious as to what the war is actually costing. The second objection is that insofar as money which is paid out by the Government in subsidies must be paid in taxes, and insofar as it is not taken to cut down the excess purchasing power of the consuming public it is, to that extent, inflationary. I think these are just arguments against subsidies, but I contend there are other arguments which counterbalance them. In the first place, we are living in a tight, unnatural, and false economy at the present time. In order to increase the production of aluminum, in order to get oil to the Atlantic seaboard, in order to import or produce many vital materials the Government has found it necessary to pay for either a certain portion of the cost of production of the commodities, or of their transportation cost. In order to secure a maximum production of food, the Government is encouraging the farmers by contracting with them by means of a pledged support price, and if the market does not pay the amount of that support price, the Government will step in and either buy the commodities, or pay the difference. That is very good. We have production of food in this country greater than any production of food that we have ever had, and I think that without the use of these contracts, the offer of the Government to indemnify the farmer against loss, that we could not possibly otherwise have had it.

I hesitate to speak with any authority about the farmer because I know so little from practical experience about farming. However, I have tried as best I could to acquaint myself with the subject, because it is of interest not only to the farmer but to the American consumer and producer, and also of interest to our national economy. As I take it, the farmer is faced with many problems he never was faced with before. He is faced with a shortage of skilled labor, with a shortage of machinery, and in consequence, it is more expensive for him to produce than it was before. Articles that the farmer buys cost more than they did before, and to that extent also the farmer must be promised a better return for his work in order that he may operate and operate not at a loss. But, in addition, there are several other factors that enter into the increased cost of food, and into this support price the Government is promising the farmer. One of them is the fact that there are certain articles of production we need badly, and consequently it is wisdom on the part of the

Government that it should encourage the production of those commodities, and ask the farmer to grow those scarce commodities rather than other commodities which the farmer is used to growing.

To that extent the use of support prices is justified. Then I am told there are certain marginal lands which are placed in production, which are responsible for giving us a larger yield, which under normal circumstances would not be farmed.

I am stressing these points to try to bring out the fact that the cost of food production at the present time includes two factors: One is the normal cost of production and the other is the abnormal cost brought about by the war. To the extent of the abnormal cost I feel that, as a matter of justice, the money which is spent by the Government in order to get into production the margin which makes the difference between almost meeting our food demands and meeting them should not properly be charged against the consumer. When the Government's program steps in and pays for a certain percentage of food cost the amount paid by the Government cannot fairly in every instance be passed on to the consumer.

One objection to subsidies which I have heard voiced many times in the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency is the inflated income of the country. Witnesses say this is the worst time in the world in which we should pay a portion of a person's food bill. I remarked a few minutes ago that we were paying a part of New England's fuel bill, and that it is only fair that we should. We are building houses close to industry in order that industry can get men to work; industries which are producing munitions and instruments of war. Those houses would not be considered economic investments under ordinary circumstances. The amount that people are paying to live in those houses does not in all instances reflect an economic rent. Therefore, the Government's loss is in effect a subsidy.

I will admit that the money for which there is no outlet in consumers' goods is greater now than it has ever been. It is obvious that this money constitutes a constant pressure against the effort to hold back inflation. But this excess income is not equally divided.

I was very much interested the other day, and I succeeded in getting some statistics compiled, which showed me that if you add the people of fixed incomes in this country to the people whose income has gone up in some instances but not as far as the cost of living, you have a total of 33,350,000 people in this country who are less able to pay their daily expenses than they were before. Those people of fixed income include people on public assistance, Government salaries, allotments, veterans' pensions, railroad retirement, and civil-service pensions. They amount to 14,000,000 people. The workers whose wages have gone up, but not as fast as the cost of living, include people in transportation, trade, Government, finance, services, and miscellaneous. They number 19,000,000. The

total of these low-income groups is therefore 33,000,000 people.

In addition to those 33,000,000 there will be the dependents of those people. Obviously in this group I have named, many of them do not have any dependents. However, some of them do. It is fair, also, to say that this figure does not take into consideration any family income in which there are two or more people working. Consequently, it should be adjusted down to a certain extent, but at any rate, you have upward of 30,000,000, plus their dependents, in this country who are not as able as they were before, to meet their ordinary expenses. It is upon this class that the increase in the cost of living will effect a hardship. They already are laboring under a hardship, and an increase in the cost of living will increase the hardship for many to the point where it becomes unbearable.

It is my hope to be again permitted to address the House on the general subject, at which time I would like to discuss several other aspects of our battle against inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CANOL PROJECT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss further with the House the one hundred and thirty-eight million Canadian oil project known as the Canol project. It is interesting, as will be noted, to see how Canada and the British Isles are insisting that the Canadian and British people understand that Canada is not making any investment in this oil development.

Recently when an appropriation was up before the Canadian Parliament for \$1,755,000, Mines and Resource Item in War appropriation, the Canadian Government was going to be certain where the money was to be expended, as you will note from a news item later.

[From the Petroleum Times of September 4, 1943]

ALASKAN HIGHWAY AND JOINT UNITED STATES-CANADA OIL PROJECT

Canada's rights in connection with the Alaska Highway and with the large project for piping oil from Fort Norman to White Horse in the Yukon, two important war projects, are fully protected for post-war use, Premier Mackenzie King assured the Canadian House of Commons recently.

He said the United States was paying the cost of the Fort Norman oil development project, and that Canada was providing sites for plants and right-of-way for the pipe line. Equipment, labor and managerial personnel were being brought in from the United States. But title to the lands affected would remain with Canada, while the pipe line and the refineries could be purchased by Canada at the end of the war.

"The United States is paying the costs of the oil project," the Prime Minister said, "and is also making oil rights available under proper regulations. The Canadian Government has also agreed during the war to waive import duties, taxes, and license fees.

"Royalties on oil produced under this project," the Prime Minister said, "are also waived for the duration of the war. The United States Government retains ownership of the pipe line and refinery until the end of the war, at which time they will be offered for sale, with the Canadian Government being given prior right of purchase. Failing a satisfactory sale being made, the disposition of the pipe line and refinery will be referred to the Permanent Joint Defense Board. It is impossible at this time to estimate the amount of money involved in the construction of the pipe line and refinery.

"Title to the land through which the pipe line runs remains in the Crown in the right of Canada," Premier King explained. "Under the agreement between the two Governments the pipe line and refinery will be offered for sale at the conclusion of the war at a valuation set by two appraisers, one named by Canada and one by the United States."

THE GREAT "CANOL" PROJECT—UNITED STATES, NOT CANADIAN, MONEY INVOLVED

A great wartime oil-development project in the North known officially as "Canol," involving the drilling of scores of wells, the laying of more than 1,000 miles of pipe line and other work, will be completed probably this year, it was announced by Capt. Freeman C. Bishop, public relations officer for the Northwest Service Command of the United States Army.

The project is said to rival the Alaska military highway in scope and the rapidity with which the entire area has been expanded to meet the increasing need of war.

Captain Bishop said the Canol project—an abbreviation for Canadian oil—would go down in wartime development history of the Northwest as a project comparable to the Alaska highway in difficulty and in results.

The undertaking is a vast program for the development of Canadian oil resources, coupled with the building of a pipe line more than 1,000 miles long through which gasoline and oil can be supplied to the fleets of trucks using the Alaska highway, to the planes which use the route to Alaska, and to steamships in Alaska ports.

The project, heretofore little mentioned outside the area of the Northwest Service Command, headed by Brig. Gen. James A. (Patsy) O'Connor, who is in active charge of the entire undertaking, is well advanced.

With drilling under way, and constantly increasing in extent, in the area of Fort Norman, 400 miles northeast of Whitehorse on the McKenzie River, the project is uncovering an oil field which has already surpassed all geologists' expectations, and is believed by some to give promise of becoming one of the most important fields on the American Continent.

General O'Connor stated recently: "From the beginning the possibilities of the project have grown almost day by day. When it was undertaken, the experts predicted that the wells of the Fort Norman field would yield only a few hundred barrels of oil a day. As drilling progressed, actual production surpassed these figures by leaps and bounds. Wells have been drilled in scattered locations, in an attempt to outline the extent of the field. The field is still not outlined. So far not one well has failed to produce oil."

In this connection, Hon. T. A. Crerar, minister of resources, told the Canadian House of Commons recently that the Dominion Government had not spent a dollar on the development of oil wells at Fort Norman or on

the pipe line to Whitehorse and other Alaskan points.

The development at Fort Norman was initiated by the United States Government to provide petroleum products for war operations in Alaska, with the Imperial Oil Co. doing the drilling and producing, he said.

The discussion arose during consideration in committee of the \$1,755,000 mines and resources item in the war appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Crerar said all the Canadian Government had done to further the development was to give the Imperial Oil Co. permits to drill in certain areas. The drilling brought results which justified the big production and pipe-line project recently announced. He said the Government had discouraged applicants for permits from purely speculative prospectors.

P. E. Wright (C. C. F. Melfort) said it appeared the Government had placed in the hands of one big company a natural resource which might prove of great commercial value.

Mr. Crerar said there was an agreement, described to the House of Commons earlier in the session by Premier King, safeguarding Canada's rights to the development when the war emergency ends.

A partial explanation of the Fort Norman, or Norman Wells, development was issued on October 14 by Mr. R. W. Gallagher, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, as follows:

The United States Government stands to be reimbursed in full for expenditures on the development of the Fort Norman oil field out of oil produced from the field. R. W. Gallagher, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, asserted yesterday in answering criticism which has arisen with respect to large Government expenditures on war projects in western Canada.

The Government, he said, is underwriting direct expenses incurred by Imperial Oil, Standard of New Jersey subsidiary in Canada, in developing the project, but this money is to be repaid to the Government through a reduction to 50 cents a barrel of the price of crude it buys. This reduction will begin after the Government has purchased 1,500,000 barrels of oil at the regular price of \$1.25 a barrel, and will continue until the Government has been reimbursed for all outlays to Imperial.

Mr. Gallagher explained that expansion of the Fort Norman (also called Norman wells) oil field was first suggested to Imperial by the United States Army in April 1942. Imperial was the only organization with oil-producing experience in that area, having operated in the far north since 1919.

Mr. Gallagher, while explaining the position of Imperial Oil with respect to the Fort Norman project, was flanked by two of the leading oil geologists of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, who are also directors. One of them, Wallace Pratt, explained in detail the Fort Norman development "off the record" and it was explained that Standard of New Jersey has long sought to make public all the facts concerning its activities in northern Canada but has been prevented from doing so by Army censorship.

Eugene Holman, the other Standard Oil geologist, outlined the circumstances under which the Fort Norman oil project was launched through discussions between Government officials and Standard Oil men at which the noted Arctic explorer, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, was present, as advisor to the United States Government.

This statement was made 2 days after I had made my remarks in the House concerning the Canol project, of which the Fort Norman field development is a part. Fort Norman field is the supply

end of the project, and it is being linked with Whitehorse, in Canada, by about 600 miles of pipe line, and at Whitehorse a refinery is being built, or is to be built.

The statement by Mr. Gallagher supplies a few details concerning the field development only. It leaves unanswered some questions which I raised. What are the terms of the contract? Between whom and under what authority was a contract made? What becomes of this gigantic investment after the war?

Since I spoke I have received the following letter from Julius H. Amberg, special assistant to the Secretary of War:

Judge Patterson has asked me to inform you that since he wrote to you on October 8, the Truman committee of the Senate has asked permission to examine the documents relating to the Canol project. Inasmuch as this was asked by a congressional committee, Judge Patterson has authorized such examination, the committee to maintain the secrecy classification, at least for the present.

Judge Patterson wishes you to know that his granting the request of the Truman committee shortly after his letter to you was solely because the request was made by a committee which one of the Houses of Congress had expressly authorized and directed to inquire into the war effort. The same right to examine the documents would be granted to the House Military Affairs Committee, which has similar authorization by resolution of the House of Representatives.

I am not consumed by personal curiosity in this matter, but I doubt that any question of military security exists which calls for continued secrecy. As I said, the enemy is concerned only with the location of the installations and the War Department has itself revealed these in a former press release and further particulars were given in published articles, including the extensive account published by Maclean's magazine of August 15, which I quoted in my remarks of October 12.

There was only one other point on which the enemy might be curious and that was the extent of the supply which might be obtained at Fort Norman. Mr. Gallagher tells about this. He said:

By January 1943, enough new wells had been drilled to produce 3,000 barrels daily. Additional wells have been drilled since that time and this capacity is being expanded still further to meet United States Army needs.

That is not an adequate explanation, but I doubt that the contract or agreement goes any further as to the "United States Army needs." It doubtless does have something in it of interest to the taxpayers of the United States who will pay the bill for this project.

They are paying the bill on the field development, which is the only phase of the project discussed by Mr. Gallagher. He makes it sound very attractive by saying that while the United States Government is—

underwriting direct expenses incurred by Imperial in developing the project—this money is to be repaid to the Government by a reduction to 50 cents a barrel of the price of crude it buys. This reduction will begin after the Government has purchased 1,500,000 barrels of oil at the regular price of \$1.25 a barrel, and will continue until the Government has been reimbursed for all outlays to Imperial.

The bargain price will not prevail, however, until one and one-half million barrels have been delivered. That may be a long time off, for I have heard that they are by no means ready with the pipe line.

Even the \$1.25 a barrel price seems low, but let us not be misled. There is only one fair way to keep the books on this project and that is to charge the entire cost, field development, pipe-line construction, refinery construction, and any other expense such as the building of the roads and airports that were needed along the pipe-line route, to the production of the oil. Lacking any other explanation, that is a fair assumption. If the whole affair is costing \$138,000,000, as Maclean's magazine said it was, then every barrel of oil produced will cost the amount represented by dividing \$138,000,000 by the number of barrels, or the cost will be about \$46,000 a barrel against \$1.294 a barrel cost to produce new oil in the United States. Let us not be diverted by quotations as to the field price. I do not assume that the Standard, through its subsidiary, Imperial Oil, Ltd., is going to make any profit. Mr. Gallagher says that the United States Army suggested the expansion of the field. The field had been known since 1919; it was 1,500 miles from any substantial market and little use had ever been made of it. Certainly, there can be no profit in that wilderness country at \$1.25 a barrel; producers here at home go broke on that price.

What we want to know here at home is what we have agreed to do. We are hearing entirely too many reports of commitments made around the world that will have to be cleaned up later. When the necessity for military secrecy has passed, or has been removed by the military itself as in the Fort Norman case, the people of this country have the right to know what is going on.

For 2 years we have been trying here at home to get a price increase on crude oil so that the producers could develop the supply for the war and the essential civilian needs. Nothing has been done and we have moved into a Nation-wide shortage that has been created by the Government. In the name of "holding the line," the consumer has been denied the privilege of getting gasoline and fuel oil at a little additional cost, while his money has been scattered far and wide in foreign countries on impractical ventures.

Now, as already stated, Mr. Gallagher, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, states that there is under production as of January 1943 about 3,000 barrels a day. This is a drop in the bucket. As I have already pointed out we are producing 4,250,000 barrels daily in the United States and he states that the United States Government is underwriting directly expenses incurred by the Imperial Oil Co. in developing the project, also that this money is to be repaid to the Government by a reduction of price of 75 cents a barrel on the crude it buys and that this reduction will begin after the Government has purchased 1,500,000 barrels at the regular price of \$1.25 per barrel, and will continue until

the Government has been reimbursed for all outlays to Imperial.

Well, if the estimated production is 3,000 barrels a day, and the Government is going to be rebated 75 cents a barrel, that would be \$2,250 a day. At \$2,250 a day into \$138,000,000 it would take 61,333 days. Well, with 365 days a year into 61,333 days, it will take 168 years to get our money back, and there is nobody in this Congress who will be very much concerned 168 years from now, nor will Mr. Gallagher.

Now, I understand the Canadian Government, according to the statement of Premier Mackenzie King in the Petroleum Times under the agreement between the two Governments, the pipe line and refineries will be offered for sale at the conclusion of the war at a quotation set by the two appraisers, one to be named by Canada and one to be named by the United States.

Now, if the contract of May 20, 1942, permits Canada to buy the property outright at the termination of the war, I cannot figure out how Mr. Gallagher, of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey can determine how we are going to get the American taxpayer's money back, because all the whole outfit will bring only scrap prices for the pipe line and refinery as there is no local market to speak of for the oil so it would be better to continue the good-neighbor policy and give Canada the whole setup outright as it will have no marketable value to speak of. I would suggest that Mr. Gallagher be careful with his statements because he might have a lot of explaining to do to the stockholders of his company for being associated with such an impractical oil venture. It appears from Mr. Gallagher's statement that he is greatly concerned so he throws out a smoke screen to confuse public thinking. He knows if there was any oil at Norman Wells that the Imperial Oil Co. would have been up there long ago and developed these properties.

It will be also noted in a newspaper report that the Arctic explorer, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, was present when the news story was given to the press, and that he was adviser to the United States Government. Now, I think it would be interesting to know who conceived this idea. Maybe it originated with the explorer. Now, it is all right to explore the Arctic and chart icebergs, but when you explore and chart for oil, you better be right and know what you are talking about or someone will pay through the nose, and in that case it happens to be the American taxpayer who is the goat in this exploration project.

I suggest that whatever committee of the Congress—the Lea petroleum committee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or Military Affairs, as suggested by Under Secretary of War Patterson—that this committee bring in the Arctic explorer and see what he can tell us about this oil project—how much oil he thinks is up in the Arctic Circle. This because it is stated that he is adviser to the United States Government—but I want to tell the Members of Congress the only way anyone can tell how much oil there is at Norman wells is when the oil

drill bites deep into the rock and the results tell the story.

In this instance what the American people are entitled to know are the terms of the contract—whether or not this is really a contribution to the war effort, or whether it was an opportunity to ascertain whether this field had any oil up in the Canadian wilderness. To me, it looks like a grand old Work Projects Administration project. Now, I do not object to a W. P. A. project if the money is expended in the United States, but I cannot reconcile the spending of the taxpayers' money up in Canada on a project of this type requiring not only our men and money but thousands of tons of material, such as pipe, 15,000 tons of which was the initial shipment, which could have been used in this country to good advantage and contributed very greatly to increasing the production of oil in the United States. Also, I have been advised that the Board of Economic Warfare sent Robert Coghill, petroleum consultant, up to Norman wells to look the job over. I talked to Mr. Coghill and he stated his report had been submitted to the Board of Economic Warfare, and I am of the opinion that Mr. Wayne Coy, of Bureau of the Budget, also completed a report. Now, whatever committee of the House handles the matter, it ought to request that Secretary Ickes, of the Petroleum Administration for War; Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Administrator for P. A. W.; Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson; Robert Coghill, of the Board of Economic Warfare; Wayne Coy, of the Bureau of the Budget; R. W. Gallagher, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and the War Department petroleum experts make public the facts concerning this Arctic oil exploration in northern Canada, and, last but not least, Arctic Explorer Vilhjalmur Stefansson, who evidently has turned from ice to oil; that they all be called in before the committee, and we should hear what they have to say about this little expenditure of \$138,000,000.

A 50-cent price increase on oil in the United States, I might say to the Members of Congress—and this is an estimate—will produce more oil in a year than they will produce at Norman wells in the next 50 years, and this without cost to the taxpayer.

I repeat my assertions of last week that there should be a thorough investigation of this Fort Norman project.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by the secretary of the American Livestock Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. **KEEFE**] is recognized for 20 minutes.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AUTOMOBILES

Mr. **KEEFE**. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that when "Boss" Flynn had an area on the grounds of his private home paved with city-owned paving blocks and used the services of employees on the public pay roll to do the job, his defense was in part that he knew nothing about the transaction and that he subsequently made good by paying for the blocks and the labor. Every effort was made at that time to belittle the charges as being insignificant in character. Later, when the President nominated Flynn to be United States Minister to Australia, objections were filed and testimony was taken in the other body in support of the charges. As a result, the incident, declared by his friends to have been trivial in character, assumed national importance, and public sentiment against Mr. Flynn became so pronounced that his nomination was withdrawn by the President.

I refer to this incident only because it may be alleged by someone that the facts which I am about to present may disclose an incident trivial in character. Because the facts which I shall relate involve what I conceive to be the integrity of the House of Representatives and because the American public are entitled to know that an overwhelming majority of the membership of this House are alert and determined to protect the public interest, I feel obligated to my colleagues and to the public to relate the facts. I shall be guided by the Rules of the House, and without statement of conclusions will let the facts speak for themselves.

Public Resolution No. 53, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 23, 1935, established a commission to be known as the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission for the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution.

The resolution provided for 18 commissioners, to be headed by the President of the United States. The resolution provided that the commissioners should receive no compensation for their services but should be paid their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. The resolution further provided that the commission might appoint a director and such associates and subordinates as the director might deem necessary. The commission was directed to make a report to the Congress in order that enabling legislation might be enacted. It further provided that the commission should expire on December 31, 1939. It authorized an appropriation of \$10,000.

Thereafter, and on June 1, 1936, Public Resolution No. 97 of the Seventy-fourth Congress was approved to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans for the observance of the formation of the Constitution of the United States. In this resolution provision is again made for the payment of actual traveling, subsistence, and other expenses in-

curred by the commissioners in the discharge of their duties. The sum of \$200,000 was authorized to be appropriated.

Public Resolution No. 63 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 19, 1937, increased the amount of the authorization from \$475,000. Public Resolution No. 92, Seventy-fifth Congress, made available additional funds for the commission.

Several appropriation acts were passed by the Congress appropriating sums of money pursuant to authority contained in the joint resolution heretofore referred to. It will be observed that a careful reading of these authorizations and appropriation acts discloses no authority that would permit the commission or the director general of the commission to purchase a passenger automobile. I might say that our colleague, Hon. **SOL BLOOM**, was appointed director general, and functioned as such during the life of the commission.

It will be observed that the Congress for years has attempted to restrict the use of passenger vehicles purchased with public funds. As early as 1904, the Congress legislated on this subject, providing that—

No part of any money appropriated by any act shall be used for purchasing, maintaining, driving, or operating any carriage or vehicle (other than those for the use of the President of the United States, the heads of the executive departments, and the secretary to the President, and other than those used for transportation of property belonging to or in the custody of the United States) for the personal or official use of any officer or employee of any of the executive departments unless the same shall specifically be authorized or provided for in terms by appropriation of money, and all such carriages and vehicles so procured and used for official purposes shall have conspicuously painted thereon at all times the full name of the executive department or other branch of the public service to which the same belong and in the service of which the same is used.

This attitude of Congress, clearly expressed in the law, has been maintained and strengthened by subsequent enactments down to the present date. In fact, section 202 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, Public Law 90, Seventy-eighth Congress, clearly enunciates the will of Congress, prohibiting the purchase or use of motor-driven passenger vehicles without specific legislative authority. The Appropriations Committee of the Congress has diligently sought to prevent the appropriation for private use of vehicles purchased with public funds.

I call attention to the various enactments of the Congress and the attitude of Congress upon this subject because no one familiar with the law could be mistaken as to the plain wording of the law, or of the spirit and intent of the Congress itself.

A few days ago I observed a Ford sedan bearing Government tag 847, driven by a colored chauffeur and occupied by the Director General of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.

This car was proceeding in the direction of my home. I observed that it was

driven only to the home of the Director General.

Because this car bore a Government license and was occupied by a Member of Congress, my interest was aroused to ascertain to what department of government the use of this automobile was assigned. I could detect nothing on the car indicating the name of the executive department or other branch of public service to which the same belonged, as the law specifically requires. In order that there might not be any chance for mistake, I investigated the ownership of this car bearing Government tag 847 and found that on July 7, 1936, an application was filed for a certificate of title signed "SOL BLOOM, Director General." This application listed the ownership of this car in the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission and stated as the source of ownership that it was acquired new on July 1, 1936, from the Cherner Motor Co., Washington, D. C., payment being made in cash. Further investigation discloses the fact that a car was purchased on July 1, 1936, by the Director General of the Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.

I further discovered that this same car has borne the same Government license tag from that day to the present.

Further investigation disclosed that when the General Accounting Office received the voucher of that purchase for audit, it was turned down by the General Accounting Office because there was no authority in law permitting the purchase of such an automobile.

Thereafter and in 1937 a resolution was submitted to the Appropriations Committee—I think in one of the deficiency bills of 1937—and authority was requested almost a year after the purchase of this car to authorize this Commission to purchase a motor-driven vehicle.

My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. **BLOOM**] has been kind enough to supply me with the testimony which he gave at that time before the Deficiency Committee on April 6, 1937. The facts developed that at the time the car was purchased there was no legal authority in law for this Commission to purchase it. Despite the plain prohibition of the law it was purchased on July 1, 1936. Thereafter, on or about April 6, 1937, the passage of a joint resolution, No. 214, which afterward became Public Law No. 121, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, authorized or ratified this illegal purchase which had been made nearly a year previous.

So it appears without question therefore, from the record, that the automobile in question bearing Government tag 847, is the property of the United States Government, paid for with public funds.

After the ascertainment of these facts some questions began to run through my mind. By the terms of the original resolution the commission itself expired December 31, 1939. Oh, yes, I have since ascertained that there were a few little things that had to be cleaned up and that the Appropriations Committee authorized funds for reprinting of this volume or another volume published by

the commission; and a small appropriation of \$500 for "personal services" was made to see that this work was finally finished and closed up.

Now it appears that the Director General very properly, after securing authority from the Congress, had the right while on official business, to use the automobile which the Congress provided. At no time has the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] ever had the right to use this publicly owned car for his private business. I am wondering, when the commission finished its real work and had ceased as a commission, why that car was not returned to the Government as surplus property in the same manner that the typewriters and other equipment that was purchased for the use of the commission were returned.

In fact, and upon occasion after occasion not only the gentleman who is addressing you but many Members of Congress have observed this car bearing a Government tag license driven on the streets of the city of Washington in a manner that evidenced clearly that it could not be, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, be in use for "official business." This car has constantly been in use to carry the gentleman from his home to the Capitol and take him home at the end of the day.

I also observed the day that I first noticed this car upon the streets that it was driven by a colored chauffeur whom I recognized as an employee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of which the Director General of this commission is also chairman. In my judgment this again constitutes a flagrant misuse of public funds.

My colleagues, this situation raises a fundamental question in my mind: First, what funds are presently being used to pay for the upkeep and maintenance of this automobile, which is Government property; whose funds pay the chauffeur; in whose name is the public liability carried on this car, the commission having gone out of business. In the event of negligent use of this automobile who would be responsible, in view of the termination of the activities of the commission, the title to the car being in the commission.

This raises some very interesting questions, and I asked some of those questions of the distinguished gentleman from New York, as he will recall.

He advised me that he had a C gas card issued in the name of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission and that his gasoline for this car was purchased by virtue of that gas-ration book. I wonder, in view of the questions asked, when a gas-ration book is issued how it is possible for a gas-ration book to be issued to a public agency that is out of existence by the very terms of the resolution creating it, in 1939.

It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that pursuant to section 843 of the District of Columbia Code no vehicle is entitled to be equipped with a Government tag unless the same is owned and officially used by an agency of the United States Government. I think it is a fair question of inquiry,

While the facts are conceded that this car is owned by the United States Government or an agency thereof, whether its present use is sufficiently official in character to justify having issued to it a Government-tag license without cost.

Mr. Speaker, these simple facts and my investigation of them clearly demonstrate that this automobile bearing Government tag 847 has been used in large part at least, for the personal convenience of the Director General of this Commission. The facts further demonstrate that an employee of the Foreign Affairs Committee has performed fairly continuous functions as chauffeur in the private use of this car.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I have presented some simple facts as I have been enabled to marshal them and verify them. I trust that the distinguished gentleman from New York may be able satisfactorily to answer the questions which I have propounded.

It may be contended that because the Committee on Appropriations authorized a republication of the history of the Constitution that the Director General may have felt he was entitled to the continued personal use of this automobile. May I say that the personal use of publicly owned cars has always been prohibited by law.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 20 minutes.

MR. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute longer.

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

MR. KEEFE. As I have previously indicated, however, the last appropriation act set up only \$500 for personal services in connection with this republication. That fact alone should indicate the rather inconsequential character of the services still remaining to be performed by the Director General.

Members of Congress have repeatedly criticized bureaucrats for the unauthorized use of publicly owned motor vehicles. It is my settled conviction that these facts should be carefully scrutinized in order that we may keep our own doorstep clean.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

MR. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 10 minutes at this time to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin. What he has stated is partly true, but I should like to explain the reasons for it.

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York may proceed for any part of 10 minutes that he desires.

There was no objection.

MR. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has just spoken. I think the House is entitled to know all of the facts, and I am very glad and happy to give them.

I do not believe I have really erred in any way. I have just tried to do my duty. In the early part of the life of the Commission I was told it was per-

missible to buy a car, and I bought the car. When the bill was presented to the General Accounting Office they stated: "You can buy a wagon, that is, a truck or delivery vehicle, but not a passenger car unless it was specifically authorized in the appropriation to the Commission."

That was news to me. I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and asked to have the item corrected, which they did. At that time there were many other things the Commission desired that the appropriation did not specifically provide for.

I should like to have you understand that I have my own car and I have my own chauffeur. The car is used down here and has never been used by me for any personal trips or for any visits anywhere. It is used for whatever it is necessary for in case we have to deliver something or do something of that kind. Outside of that it is little used. If I wanted to hide anything I would not park it right out here in front where every Member of the House passes it and sees it.

Let me give you the whole story. This is the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations under date of April 6, 1937. I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and explained to the committee about the car and other things and I would like to read the following:

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1937

(Hearings conducted by the subcommittee, Messrs. Edward T. Taylor, chairman; Clifton A. Woodrum, John J. Boylan, Clarence Cannon, Louis Ludlow, Thomas S. McMillan, J. Buell Snyder, John Taber, Robert L. Bacon, and Richard B. Wigglesworth, of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in charge of deficiency appropriations, on the days following, namely, Tuesday, April 6, 1937)

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—STATEMENT OF HON. SOL BLOOM, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Authorization for certain miscellaneous expenses

MR. WOODRUM. We have under consideration House Joint Resolution No. 214, which was referred to the Appropriations Committee and in turn referred to the deficiency subcommittee for consideration.

The resolution is as follows:

"Resolved, etc., That the appropriation for the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, shall be available, in addition to the objects of expenditure for which available under existing law, for rent in the District of Columbia, individual photographs, books, periodicals, newspapers, newspaper clippings, purchase, maintenance, repair and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, notarial seals, per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence within and outside the District of Columbia, and including payment of obligations for the foregoing purposes heretofore incurred in connection with the work of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission."

You may proceed, Mr. Bloom.

MR. BLOOM. Gentlemen, I might say at the outset that we are very anxious to have this resolution passed so as to enable us to go ahead and pay bills that have already been contracted for.

This resolution was introduced primarily because the General Accounting Office sent

back quite a few of our bills stating that under the act we did not have the authority to buy these different items and obligate the Commission for these sums.

We have encumbered, or rather we have bought and obligated the Commission for the many items I have outlined on this sheet thus far. In fact, all the items that we have are not listed. For example, they will not allow us to buy individual photographs. Well, of course, you cannot run this Commission without buying individual photographs, such as photographs of the individual signers of the Constitution, and, I might say, that we sell these in sets.

We bought a four-passenger Ford car to be used in going around to the different departments and the printers. This was the cheapest car we could find. Then the General Accounting Office said: "This is a passenger car and you must have special legislation. If it was a truck you could buy it." But, we had already bought it.

Just to illustrate how things are, they do not permit us to buy any cars or press clippings.

Mr. WOODRUM. Have you a list of the items that have been challenged by the General Accounting Office up to the present time?

Mr. BLOOM. Up to a certain date, but we have been buying them because we could not get along without them. In other words, we would have to stop all this buying if we had waited for them to put their approval on all of the necessary items that we needed.

Mr. WOODRUM. How will you pay for them if they are not authorized?

Mr. BLOOM. I will then pay for them myself. I have done it before.

Mr. WOODRUM. Have you a list?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I have a list.

Mr. WOODRUM. But do you have a list of all of the items that have been challenged by the General Accounting Office?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. What changes in the present law does the present modification make?

Mr. BLOOM. It merely specifies the things we are allowed to buy.

Mr. WOODRUM. What does it permit you to buy?

Mr. BLOOM. Photographs.

Mr. WOODRUM. Individual photographs?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; books, periodicals, newspapers, newspaper clippings, purchase, maintenance, repair and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, notarial seals, per diem allowance in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence within and outside the District of Columbia, and including payment of obligations for the foregoing purposes heretofore incurred in connection with the work of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission.

Mr. TABER. Where does "per diem" in the United States come in? Does that mean people working in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLOOM. We were entitled to people in the District. You do not allow me any expense. During the bicentennial you allowed \$25,000 for entertaining expenses and I paid it all myself and you did not pay a cent.

Mr. TABER. Would it be actual expenses in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLOOM. If I pay all the expenses I should get them back.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but how would that expense be incurred, that is "subsistence within and outside the District of Columbia"? You would have to bring people here from outside to qualify under that, would you not?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; then suppose I am here and a committee comes here from any other part of the country and I pay all the expenses. I mean, if I give any lunch or dinner; I pay for it and I should get it back some way.

Mr. LUDLOW. As I understand, Mr. Bloom, you are not asking for additional funds?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. LUDLOW. You just want to cover objects that you were unable to cover under the other resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; and this does it.

Mr. LUDLOW. And you do not want another dollar?

Mr. BLOOM. No, sir; not yet.

Mr. LUDLOW. Leave out the "not yet."

Mr. BLOOM. I do not want to have it on the record that I will not come later and ask you for more money.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not understand the language. You are talking about its authorizing you to be reimbursed for entertaining people. It seems that language would authorize you to "receive per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence within or outside the District of Columbia."

Mr. BLOOM. That is what the General Accounting Office informed me should be in the bill for me to be reimbursed.

Mr. WOODRUM. It would seem like subsistence allowance of employees working for you, if you were paying them an allowance.

Mr. BLOOM. No; that is not for employees.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is a very indefinite allowance.

Mr. TABER. How much money is embodied in these disallowed items?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know up to date what it is; this goes back some time. There is one item of the clipping bureau in the amount of \$613.24 that they have in this one item to the Burrell Clipping Bureau. Of course we continued that service right along.

Mr. TABER. You have quite a lot of items down there [indicating].

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The total you have down to that date is about what?

Mr. BLOOM. It would be about \$1,500 or \$2,000.

Mr. TABER. And that was down to about what date?

Mr. BLOOM. I say August 25, 1936, in this. But I am talking about up to date it is about that sum.

Mr. TABER. It is about \$1,500 or \$2,000 to date.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. You say that the profits from the receipts equal the amount of this appropriation?

Mr. BLOOM. It more than equals it.

Mr. WOODRUM. Is it the intention of the Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to place on sale any documents, publications, or exhibits that you are getting up?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Do you expect to realize any consideration from those sales and will there be a profit from them?

Mr. BLOOM. I expect to realize the cost of production of the different articles and books and pamphlets that the Commission is issuing and there will be a profit for the Government.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will that profit substantially take care of the cost of the celebration?

Mr. BLOOM. It will.

Mr. WOODRUM. Those funds will be covered into the general funds of the Treasury and will not come to you?

Mr. BLOOM. No; we would not handle any money. All checks are made payable to the Treasurer of the United States and the cash which comes in the office of the Commission, a check is made out, a double check, and cash registered, and that cash is deposited every day to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. WOODRUM. As I understand it, the necessity for this legislation is that in the language making the appropriation they failed to set out those general items.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. And there is a general law to the effect that no funds can be expended for these items unless they are set out in the appropriation.

Mr. BLOOM. Absolutely.

Mr. WOODRUM. If they had been set out in the appropriation bill that would be all right.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; and we would not be here today.

Mr. TABER. Do you figure that you could pay for all these items under this resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; the General Accounting Office gave me these different items and told me practically what I should do. I have sent different things up on a preaudit and they have sent it back to me. Here is one which they sent back, and here is one for the clippings that they would not approve.

Mr. TABER. I think, in regard to those official cards that you would like to have, that if you inserted in the resolution the words "official cards" after the word "newspapers," that would take care of that particular item.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Are there any further questions? If there are not, we thank you, Mr. BLOOM.

In other words, during the bicentennial I paid for the automobile and the upkeep of the automobile, the running of it and everything else, and when it came time for the Constitution celebration I told them: "I used up one Lincoln car. I do not think I should do it again. I think they should supply a car for that purpose." And I went and bought the cheapest automobile I could, a cheap Ford. That is all there is to it.

I would like to have the Members read the complete testimony before the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman could have found full information if he had so wanted. I sent him a letter and showed him everything and the Appropriations Committee has all of the testimony and evidence that anyone would want to have.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I would prefer not to.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that I stated I have that testimony right before me.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. KEEFE. I have that testimony right before me.

Mr. BLOOM. No; no. It is not printed, and I told you so in the letter. I mentioned that the most important testimony is contained in the unprinted transcript of the hearings held by the Appropriations Committee on March 16, 1938.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I may be permitted to place a letter I wrote to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I hope he will not object to that because it gives a pretty fair explanation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1943.

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: In compliance with your verbal request the other day, I am enclosing herewith a copy of the final report of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission which is embodied in the volume entitled, "History of the Formation of the Union Under the Constitution." I wish to call your attention to the original act creating the Constitution Commission, approved August 23, 1935, which appears on

page iv. The report section of this volume begins on page 581, and you will notice on page 583 that the Congress authorized appropriations totaling \$485,000, of which only \$360,000 was appropriated; \$15,000 was appropriated in addition for the publication of the final volume, instead of the \$50,000 requested. Because of this reduction in appropriation from the amount originally authorized, the original plans for a three-volume set, to contain the historical matter and data compiled by the Commission and a detailed report of the Commission's activities, were necessarily condensed into one volume.

You will notice in the pages following 581 that a comprehensive report of the activities of the Commission and the various commemorative items issued by the Commission is shown in as much detail as practicable. Funds were appropriated for the Commission in the following acts:

Public Law No. 440, Seventy-fourth Congress (supplemental deficiency bill for 1936), \$10,000.

Public Law No. 739, Seventy-fourth Congress (first deficiency appropriation for 1936), \$200,000.

Public Law No. 121, Seventy-fifth Congress (second deficiency appropriation for 1937), additional authorization.

Public Law No. 354, Seventy-fifth Congress (third deficiency appropriation for 1937), \$100,000.

Public Law No. 416, Seventy-sixth Congress (urgent deficiency appropriation for 1940), additional authorization.

Public Law No. 361, Seventy-sixth Congress (third deficiency appropriation for 1939), \$15,000.

Public Law No. 150, Seventy-seventh Congress (second deficiency appropriation for 1941), additional authorization.

Public Resolution No. 92, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, \$50,000 (H. J. Res. 623).

Public Law No. 763, Seventy-seventh Congress (second supplemental national defense appropriation for 1943), additional authorization.

I am also enclosing photostatic copies of pages from the following appropriation hearings from which you will note that extensive reports regarding activities and disbursements made by the Commission were submitted from time to time to the Committee on Appropriations.

Second deficiency appropriation bill for 1937, pages 1, 2, 3, and 4.

First deficiency appropriation bill for 1938, pages 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

Third deficiency appropriation bill for 1939, pages 695, 696, 697, and 698.

Second supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1943, pages 291 and 292.

The most extensive report is contained in the unprinted transcript of the hearings on Public Law No. 92 of the Seventy-fifth Congress. During those hearings, on March 16, 1938, I submitted full and conclusive statements which had been prepared with the assistance of special auditors from the General Accounting Office.

I might mention here that all purchases and contracts for materials were handled strictly in accordance with General Accounting Office regulations and procedure and all vouchers issued had to be approved by the General Accounting Office before payment was made. In other words, vouchers in payment of bills against the Constitution Commission were drawn, approved by me, and sent to the General Accounting Office, where a check was issued and sent the payee only after the General Accounting Office approval had been given.

In order to obtain greater distribution of commemorative publications and items, the Commission secured congressional approval to sell items and to use the proceeds of such sales in a revolving fund for the purchase of

additional items for further distribution. A total of \$158,115.33 was deposited in the United States Treasury from the proceeds of such sales. Four thousand nine hundred and fifty-five dollars and twenty-one cents of this amount has been deposited since January 1, 1943, and helped make possible a reprint of the volume entitled "History of the Formation of the Union Under the Constitution," 10 copies of which will soon be distributed through the House folding room to each Representative and 20 copies to each Senator. There is an unexpended balance of funds in the United States Treasury of \$493.85.

For your information, I am enclosing copies of specimen deposit sheets showing how deposits were made in the United States Treasury of the sums received from the sale of books, pictures, etc.

If there is any further information you may desire, kindly let me know and it will be a pleasure to see that it is furnished you promptly.

Sincerely yours,

SOL BLOOM.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I did get permission from the Appropriations Committee to buy this automobile. The members of that committee asked other questions.

I would like to explain about this. I have never been allowed a petty expense account. Mr. Speaker, I want you to believe me when I say this has been a labor of love with me. I have tried to do my duty, and if I made a mistake I am sorry for it. I can assure you I do not need any automobile of the Government, and I would not be seen going up to any place with it unless it was on official business.

The gentleman spoke about a C card. I told him I did not know anything about that. I know I, personally, am paying for the gasoline. That is all I know. He says I am not entitled to it, but I do not know anything about that. Let me refer again to this testimony:

Mr. TAHER. When this per diem in the United States comes up, does that mean people working in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BLOOM. We were entitled to have people in the District. You do not allow me any expense. During the Bicentennial you allowed \$25,000 for entertaining expenses, and I paid it all myself and you did not pay a cent.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry this whole thing came up. Let me explain this.

Mr. Speaker, the commission did expire on June 30 of this year, and we had some money left over. The Appropriations Committee said: "Sol, the members have been asking for more books on the formation of the Union under the Constitution. If we allow you this appropriation, why do you not get out additional books and distribute them to Members?" I said I would love to do that and I told them: "I will revise it and bring it up to date."

It was only recently that I corrected the last proof. Every Member of the House will receive 10 copies of it and 20 copies will be allotted each Senator. This work I did in my spare hours. I do not have time to do this. I was not allowed any further expenses for clerical assistance. Where else can I get it except through the messenger boy allowed the committee? I have not spent any money for anything else.

It might appear that the Commission went out of existence on June 30 of this year, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to do everything I can to give all of the information and valuable material to the Members without 1 cent of cost to the Government. If I am to be criticized for that, I am sorry, but I do not think I have made a mistake.

That is the story. The automobile was purchased by me in good faith, but I purchased a passenger car instead of a truck and the General Accounting Office would not allow it. The Congress later approved my actions. We are working on these things to give them to you and within the next 3 or 4 weeks you will each receive 10 additional copies of this volume. This has been sold for \$2.50 by the Superintendent of Documents.

That is my story and I want you to believe it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. SMITH of Maine, indefinitely, on account of Naval Affairs Committee assignment to hold hearings on the west coast.

DR. GEORGE C. RUHLAND

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, when I read in the local press a few days ago that Dr. George C. Ruhland, the health officer of the District, is under attack and his removal from office is being demanded by a senatorial investigating committee because of certain unsatisfactory conditions at Gallinger Hospital, I took the trouble to gather a few facts regarding his record here and heretofore. I cannot permit the reputation he has earned by outstanding service in the field of public health for many years to be ruined without saying a word in his defense. I do this on my own initiative, without any request from him or anybody else, because I have known Dr. Ruhland and his work for 20 years.

Before coming to Washington he was the commissioner of health in my home city, Syracuse, N. Y. He held that position when I was corporation counsel of the city and we were closely associated in our official life. As a member of the city board of estimate and apportionment, I frequently heard him argue for larger appropriations for public health. He usually won his point and the results he obtained in my home town fully justified his demands. Our health records were vastly improved, our mortality rates substantially lowered. We took pride in the fact that during his regime our infant mortality rate was lower than that of any comparable city.

Dr. Ruhland came to Syracuse in 1924 as director of the Milbank fund health demonstration. The demonstration was a complete success. It taught us that

public health can be purchased when adequate funds are placed at the disposal of a competent public health officer, and that appropriations for public health are a splendid investment from the economic as well as the humanitarian point of view.

When the demonstration was completed Dr. Ruhland was retained as commissioner of health of Syracuse and, although his appointment was at first unpopular with the local medical profession, he had the respect and the confidence of the profession and the people of the city when he resigned in 1935 to accept the bigger job with a smaller salary as health officer of Washington.

Dr. Ruhland was born abroad of American parents. His brothers and sisters were born here and he came to this country as a babe in arms. He graduated from Concordia College in 1897 and from Marquette University Medical School in 1904 after a brief career as a newspaperman and a war correspondent during the Spanish-American War. He practiced medicine, taught in the medical college in Milwaukee, directed the laboratory work in the Milwaukee Health Department, and in 1912 was made health commissioner of Milwaukee. His work there was interrupted by the First World War when he served at Fort Sill as director of laboratories in the base hospital with the rank of major.

In Milwaukee, as in Syracuse, he reorganized the health department, improved and enlarged public health clinics, nursing, instruction, and service. Although both are industrial cities, their mortality ratings are in the lowest group.

In 1934 the District of Columbia found itself in need of a public health officer of proven ability. A committee of distinguished physicians was appointed to canvass the country and select the best available man. The committee included such men as the president of the District of Columbia Medical Society and the American Medical Association, the dean of George Washington University Medical School, the Assistant Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and the dean of the medical school of Howard University.

Dr. Ruhland was recommended and appointed. There was no politics in his appointment. If he has any political affiliations, I do not know what they are.

Now, let us see what kind of a record Dr. Ruhland has made as Health Officer of the District. Here are a few facts:

Despite the overcrowded conditions in Washington due to the war, the death rate in 1942 was 10.8 per thousand population, the lowest in the history of the city. The rate has been reduced from 14 per 1,000 in 1937 to 10.8 in 1942, including the deaths at Glenn Dale Sanitarium in Maryland.

The deaths from pneumonia have fallen from 139 per 100,000 population in 1936 to 60 in 1942.

Since 1935, when there were 29 deaths from diphtheria, the rate of mortality from this disease has steadily declined. In 1942, with an increased population there were only three victims of diphtheria.

For 10 years there have been no cases of smallpox and, of course, no deaths.

Typhoid fever took 3 lives in 1942, as compared with 10 in 1936 and 12 in 1937.

One of the most serious health problems in Washington is the prevalence of tuberculosis, particularly among the colored people. Deaths from this disease have dropped from 107 per 100,000 population in 1936 to 72.8 in 1942, which is the lowest mortality rate in the District's history.

The maternal mortality rate in 1942 was also a new low for the District. It dropped from 6.5 per 1,000 live births in 1936 to 2.2 in 1942.

Infant mortality shows a similar decline. In 1936 there were 72 infant deaths per 1,000 live births; in 1942 there were 44.8.

The health officer of the District cannot claim entire credit for the improvement in the health records, but these facts and figures ought to be sufficient to prove to any fair-minded person that Dr. Ruhland has supervised and directed a job of incalculable value to this city during his incumbency.

I think the record shows that he has tackled his job manfully and successfully despite the difficulties of dealing with legislative committees and appropriation committees of both the Senate and the House. There have been improvements in the departments of his office dealing with administration, health education, vital statistics, maternal and child health, public health nursing, sanitation, food inspection, preventive diseases, tuberculosis control, venereal disease control, health of school children, dental services, laboratories, and social service.

I have not any doubt that many of the criticisms leveled at Gallinger Hospital are well taken. Public institutions are seldom administered as well as those under private control and sponsorship. If there is not a local board of good citizens charged with the responsibility of visitation and inspection, there ought to be. A voteless District cannot hold its public officials to strict accountability, but enlightened public opinion is an irresistible force.

Congress cannot escape its share of responsibility for any defects there may be in the equipment and management of Gallinger Hospital. Ever since he has been in Washington Dr. Ruhland has asked for appropriations sufficient to permit him to discharge the heavy duties of his office. He has not been given them.

During the past 6 years the health officer has requested budgetary increases for buildings, repairs, and personnel at Gallinger Hospital amounting to \$1,424,757. He was allowed \$428,560, although some additional funds were provided in deficiency appropriation bills and sources other than regular appropriations. In that same period he asked for 497 additional employees—medical officers, technicians, nurses, dieticians, attendants, clerks, stenographers, janitors, domestics, laborers—and was given an increase of 206. To be more specific, recommendations were made when the 1944 District of Columbia bill was being considered for an assistant superintendent, a secretary,

a clerk, 2 associate medical officers, 2 social workers, and 2 clerk-stenographers, a total of 9 new employees. Two were authorized—1 clerk and 1 associate medical officer.

The members of the Appropriations Committee of the House are, without exception, men of high character and ability doing their conscientious best to eliminate waste and extravagance in Government expenditures. I admire and respect them all. I respectfully suggest, however, that the conditions at Gallinger Hospital which have caused so much criticism are due in large part to inadequate appropriations. I believe in economy, but not at the expense of national defense or public health.

Despite the attacks being made on Gallinger Hospital and the men responsible for its administration and management, the medical service there is recognized as being of a high order, and it is known as an institution for advanced study in surgery, orthopedics, urology, and obstetrics. It is unfortunate that current publicity has so besmirched the reputation of the hospital that many poor people dependent on its facilities are refusing to accept its services.

The investigation of Gallinger Hospital will undoubtedly have a salutary effect. Its shortcomings as well as its needs have been brought to light. I think they may be ascribed almost entirely to lack of manpower and funds.

It would be the height of folly and rank injustice to victimize Dr. Ruhland, the exceedingly able health officer of the District, for a situation he did not create and has struggled to correct.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2888. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; and

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, October 20, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40

of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the petroleum subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, October 21, 1943.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on the petroleum situation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The hearing which was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on the bill, H. R. 3334, relating to certain benefits to trainees in the Maritime Service, has been postponed until Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

859. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated June 5, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, the Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida, with a view to the construction of side channels; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

860. A letter from the Director, War Relocation Authority, transmitting a copy of the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the second quarter of fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

861. A letter from the administrative officer, Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting one copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements, which represents the revised request of this agency for approval of a personnel ceiling during the quarter ending December 31, 1943, consistent with the needs as now determined; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

862. A letter from the Chief, Budget and Accounts Division, Department of Commerce, transmitting corrected form regarding estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

863. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting with reference to his letter dated January 7, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 541), reporting similar cases, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 445 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

864. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Ethel

Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Lafayette Gibson; with amendment (Rept. No. 781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 3488 (by request). A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3489. A bill relating to certain Japanese residents of the United States and to certain citizens of Japanese descent found to be unfriendly to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3490. A bill to extend certain reemployment benefits of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and certain benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to persons who enter employment classified as essential by the War Manpower Commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3491. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3492. A bill to authorize the removal of Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve officers from the honorary retired list under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3493. A bill relating to the retired pay and retired grade of certain commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Stabilization Director to grant an increase of a minimum of 8 cents an hour to all nonoperating and operating railroad employees; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. Res. 325. Resolution providing examiners and other personnel necessary for the acquisition of adequate information for the use of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 326. Resolution providing for expenses of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations in carrying out the provisions of House Resolution 325; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. Res. 327. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies are requested to appear and answer questions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 3494. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillie L. Woolfolk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 3495. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for

the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Constantino Arguelles, Concha Arguelles, wife, and four minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Ernest A. Grottko; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Antonios Athanasios Kantaras; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3498. A bill for the relief of Doris Bertha Goodridge (nee Luis); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Julia Randall; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3058. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Veronica Baethke, of Elmhurst, Ill., and 21 other citizens, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3059. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Ellensburg, Yakima, Cowiche, Harrah, Wapato, White Swan, Touchet, Pasco, Wallula, and Free-water, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3060. By Mr. MAHON: Petition signed by J. T. Curb, G. W. Roach, and 203 other persons of Garza County, Tex., urging passage of House bill 836; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3061. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution signed by Fred A. Noah, president, and L. A. Johnston, secretary, of the Egyptian Chapter No. 1, American War Dads, of Albion, Ill., and unanimously adopted October 7, 1943, by said organization, urging the immediate passage of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude petroleum in order to stimulate that production much needed in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3062. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Etta Nutting, of Clermont, Iowa, and sundry other citizens, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3063. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Mrs. Edwin A. Lloyd, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and 40 other residents of that city, requesting that Congress pass House bill 2082, a measure introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. Bryson, of South Carolina, having for its purpose the reduction of absenteeism, conserving manpower, and the speeding of the production of material necessary for the winning of the war by the prohibition of the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3064. Also, petition of E. Barthel, proprietor, Union Hotel, and 19 other residents of Fishkill and Dutchess County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation, and contending that professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force consideration and passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war, bring back prohibition by banning the sale of beer which is opposed by the War and Navy Departments as well as by the great majority of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians, and would destroy legalized control and cause the loss of Federal rev-

enues without benefits to either State or Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3065. By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: Petition of Evangelist E. L. Banta and 10,484 residents of the Twentieth Illinois Congressional District, requesting the banning of alcohol and immorality around Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3066. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Charles Schneider Bakery, Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3067. Also, petition of N. Karras, Washington, D. C., and signed by six other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3068. Also, petition of Frank H. Kane of Washington, D. C., and 146 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3069. Also, petition of B. J. Rommal, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3070. Also, petition of the Monroe Grill, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3071. Also, petition of Melvin Ecardt and 21 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3072. Also, petition of Mrs. Leonard Kohr and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3073. Also, petition of H. P. Koenig and 39 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3074. Also, petition of Henry Will and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3075. Also, petition of William H. Kellermann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3076. Also, petition of Herman V. Juergens and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3077. Also, petition of Edward Schenkel and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3078. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Kimerle and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3079. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Weiner and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3080. Also, petition of Joseph King and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3081. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 536 citizens of the State of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3082. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Frank E. Fox, of McCleary, Wash., and 13 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3083. Also, petition of Julia Kangas, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 89 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3084. Also, petition of R. K. Weir, of Cosmopolis, Wash., and 59 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3085. Also, petition of Emma E. Meissner, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 59 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3086. Also, petition of Helen Richards, of Hoquiam, Wash., and 25 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3087. Also, petition of E. K. Snider, of Vail, Wash., and 29 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3088. Also, petition of H. J. Steele, of Olympia, Wash., and 59 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3089. Also, petition of W. H. Amsbary, of Olympia, Wash., and 59 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3090. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Defense League of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3091. Also, petition of the Puerto Rico Farmers Association, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the Organic Act for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

3092. Also, petition of the Central Committee of the Finnish Societies of Greater New York, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning con-

sideration of their resolution with reference to the Finnish-American Trade Union Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art to be surely found if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee; Thou art known by those who love; Thou art seen by those whose hearts are pure; Thou art heard by those who hush earth's blatant noises and in the quietness listen with reverent hearts. Thou hast given us thoughts that wander off into eternity. From the deepest valleys of distress and despair we lift our eyes to lofty heights on the far horizon, because Thou hast so made us that the glory of our life can never be beneath.

O God of Light, as we face a darkened world, grant to our minds that illumination without which we grope in a night from which the stars are gone and know not whither we go. May no blighting unbelief lie like withered leaves in the hidden hollows of our hearts. Forbid that when radiant human hopes are flaming in the skies we should be blinded by the smoke of our own campfires. When great ideas whose time has come beckon us to be their servants, save us from giving ourselves to the dead past, rather than to the living future. We ask it in the name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 19, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 19, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Barkley	Butler
Andrews	Bilbo	Byrd
Bailey	Brewster	Capper
Ball	Bridges	Caraway
Bankhead	Buck	Chandler
Barbour	Burton	Chavez